

CHURCH
or
SECT

A. C. COOPER-MARSDIN, D.D.

Class

280.3R

Book

2788

General Theological Seminary Library

Chelsea Square, New York

PRESENTED BY

Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

CHURCH OR SECT



(Photo by Lanfier, Ltd.)

Faithfully Yours
A.C. Cooper Marsden

CHURCH *or* SECT

BY

A. C. COOPER-MARSDIN, D.D.

Hon. Canon of Rochester

*Author of "The History of the Lerins," "Caesarinus, Bishop
of Arles," "The Holy Communion Service in the Book
of Common Prayer," &c., &c.*

SECOND AND ENLARGED EDITION

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT,
ROXBURGHE HOUSE,
PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

MCMXVIII

All rights reserved.

280.3R

C 788

65712

SOME PRESS NOTICES OF THE FIRST EDITION.

"Present our claims in a telling and charitable way; and in parishes which are troubled with Dissent, they might be usefully distributed."—*Church Times*.

"An arsenal of arguments in defence of the position of the Church of England."—*Commonwealth*.

"Good, sound, practical, and full of instruction and common sense."—*Church of England Pulpit*.

"We should be glad if the author could extend this excellent series of papers."—*Church Bells*.

"Many would profit much from what is ably and in an interesting way put out."—*Rochester Diocesan Chronicle*."

"No page will be perused without the reader having a clearer light shed upon many contentious subjects."—*Rochester and Chatham Journal*.

"Refreshing in its vigour, the points of the arguments put most clearly, a definiteness of language, a firmness of conviction, an honesty of purpose we cannot but admire."—*Church of Ireland Gazette*.

"Books for the times."—*Expository Times*.

"A very handy book . . . of great service to those who wish to understand the position of the Church of England."—*Western Morning News*.

88 '19

TO
MY WIFE
MY
DEVOTED COMPANION.

In Memoriam.

"And He gave some . . . pastors and teachers . . . for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."

If any preface or explanation were required to commend the following pages, these words would, I believe, express better than any others the purpose with which they were written. Canon Cooper-Marsdin, who was called to the fuller life on August 16th, 1918, was essentially a pastor and teacher, and when failing health limited his bodily activities he continued to use his mind and his pen for the benefit of others. Life for him, if hardly long in actual years, had been so full, varied and vigorous, that he had ample material at his command as well as the leisure for thinking out some of those problems which will never be solved in the heat of the working hours.

Ordained deacon in 1891 by the Bishop of Wakefield, his first curacy was at Heckmondwike in Yorkshire, the county to which he belonged by birth and to which he always gave his whole-hearted and proud allegiance and service. In later years when called to work in the South, his friends and fellow-workers were often conscious of certain sterling qualities and methods of dealing with men which are usually associated with the North Country, and especially with Yorkshire. A keen athlete himself, he excelled in various sports, won many prizes at tennis, and in 1911 captained, at their annual cricket match at Lords, a team of the Society of Yorkshiremen in London, against a team of Lancastrians. His name is still remembered at Heckmondwike by a Challenge Cup which he gave to be competed for annually by cricket teams connected with places of worship of all denominations. In 1895 he was appointed curate-in-charge of the Church of St. John the Evangelist, Bexley, Kent, and here his sympathy with working men found its outlet in the building of a

Working Men's Club, to work on an unsectarian and non-political basis. It was here that he met, and in 1900 married, Elsie Mary Bristow, eldest daughter of H. J. Bristow, of the Mount, Bexley Heath, to whose never failing help and sympathy he owed so much for the rest of his life.

In the same year he accepted the post of curate-in-charge of Borstal, a suburb of Rochester, which was constituted a separate parish in 1902, when he became its first vicar, remaining there till 1905. During these years he proved the reality of his vocation as a pastor, winning the hearts of his people and establishing many bonds of friendship which have outlived him. The church was enlarged and beautified, an endowment fund was raised and various parochial activities were brought into being. And his energies were not limited to Borstal, for his interesting and stimulating sermons drew thoughtful and enquiring men and women from all the district, even free-thinking dockyardmen, at that time somewhat numerous, counting it worth their while to go over to hear him. It will be of interest to the readers of this book to learn that its subject was already occupying Mr. Cooper-Marsdin's attention, as in Lent, 1905 he preached a series of sermons on "Why I am a Churchman," etc., which were afterwards published under the title of "Church or Sect," of which the present volume is an enlarged edition.

In 1905 the Diocese of Southwark was severed from that of Rochester, which necessitated the creation of entirely fresh diocesan machinery in the older See.

Mr. Cooper-Marsdin undertook the post of secretary to the Diocesan Association, and for seven years gave of his very best to the manifold duties it involved. Beginning with but a remnant of organization (all the larger part of the existing association had been swept into Southwark), he gradually extended his system of parochial secretaries until in 1911 only two parishes in the diocese were unrepresented, and the annual income had been raised to nearly £6,000. The happy combination of marked business ability and knowledge with a warm and sympathetic nature and a firm belief in the ideals involved

in real and vigorous Church life, made his work both thorough and progressive. The fund for the endowment of poor parishes, no less than the building of Mission Churches in newly populated districts, prospered under his hand; but it is, perhaps, the scheme for Insurance against Dilapidations which will always be most closely associated with his tenure of office. Rochester was the first diocese to put such a scheme into practice, although several others have since followed its example more or less closely. In 1911 Mr. Cooper-Marsdin was elected to represent the Dean and Chapter of Rochester in the Lower House of Convocation, thereby creating a precedent, as up to then no unbeneficed Proctor had been known in Convocation for some hundreds of years. He attended Convocation very regularly; even, in spite of failing health in July, 1918, and spoke on several occasions. His authority on all matters connected with Dilapidations was acknowledged by his being placed on the Committee of Convocation for Ecclesiastical Dilapidations. In the winter of 1912 he was laid aside by a serious illness from the effects of which he never wholly recovered, and was obliged to resign the secretaryship of the R.D.S., for which he had spent himself so willingly.

In December of the same year he was made an Honorary Canon of Rochester. The winter of 1913-14 had again to be spent abroad, and during these months he acted as Chaplain at Arosa. In the previous year he had used his leisure to finish his "History of the Lerins," which was published in 1913, and it must be borne in mind that though his active life stands out in highest relief, yet Canon Cooper-Marsdin was also essentially a scholar, and in the midst of all his work never ceased to read and think. He received the degree of D.D. from Dublin, in 1913, and that of B.D. from Cambridge in 1914, his thesis being on the history of the Lerins.

When he returned to England in the spring of 1914, his friends hoped that his health was fully re-established, but almost at once he received a great blow in the sudden illness of his younger brother, Frederick B. Marsdin, then Vicar of St. Matthew's, West Kensington. After a very

serious operation recovery was found to be hopeless, and Canon and Mrs. Cooper-Marsdin devoted the next nine months to nursing him in their home at Bickley. Canon Cooper-Marsdin also acted as vicar-in-charge of his brother's parish until the latter's death in 1915. The strain of that winter was, of course, very severe, but his health stood it better than might have been expected, and after a month or two he began to consider future work. To a man of his character the claims of the men in the ever-growing fighting forces stood high, and in April, 1915, he sent in his application to the Chaplain-General. One of the last acts of his close friend and fellow worker, Archdeacon Rowe, was to sign the papers necessary for his commission which he received early in May.

From May, 1915, he served as Chaplain at Portsmouth, Shoreham and Harwich, but in November, 1916, his old trouble appeared. From that time his life was to a large extent that of an invalid with much suffering and discomfort, though his mind was always keen and alert. From August, 1917, to January, 1918, he tried sanatorium treatment, and during those months the following pages were written. A very serious relapse in February seemed to make entire recovery very doubtful; but during the summer he rallied a little and was able to see his book ready for publication, having corrected the last proofs a few days before his death.

That his clearly expressed thoughts, based on a thorough knowledge of ecclesiastical history, tempered by a practical reasonableness and a very Christian charity, will prove of real use to many in these days of doubt and perplexity, can hardly be doubted. Just as in his own life a warm-hearted sympathy coloured all the achievements of his active brain and personality, so throughout these pages, in which he gives his last message to those who have the responsibility of the future developments of their church, there runs that golden thread of charity which will surely one day make "the Church of England the Church of all good men and women in England."

M. E. R.

FOREWORD.

WE are often told that "it does not really matter whether we are Church or Chapel, as we are all aiming at the same place." In answer to the question "Are you a Churchman or a Dissenter?" people sometimes say, "I have no quarrel with either." While far too many never trouble to examine the grounds of, or reasons for, their faith, there are also many who would like to know at least some of the points which divide the Church and the sects. In an excellent paper read by Mr. J. St. G. Heath at the Seventeenth Annual Conference of the Parents' National Educational Union,¹ on "Education and Social Sympathy," he warns against "a sham tolerance" which comes from our not caring enough about things, or is based upon a belief "that nothing matters enough to make it worth while persuading other people of its truth." He then gives us some indications of what he calls "social sympathy." The first is a wish to understand intellectually what are the issues at stake, and a deliberate refusal to accept catchwords for realities. Another mark is to know

¹ Reported verbatim in "The Parents' Review," July 1913.

almost instinctively when those who differ from us are upheld by a certainty, which, if we cannot share, we must at least respect. Then it is essential to believe that those who differ from us are as sincere in their beliefs as we are in ours.

Now, it is well to remember that toleration was little known in days gone by; and people had a very rough and ready way of dealing with those who differed from them. They said, "We are right and you are wrong, and we must put you right!" And they proceeded to do so by hanging them or burning them!

We are now gradually, if slowly, learning the better way. We are divided; we cannot hide our eyes from this fact. Let us study our differences with open mind and charitable heart, and let us ever bear in mind that no one denomination has the monopoly of truth. Broadly speaking, Anglicanism represents "the official, historical, objective element in Christianity and guards the authoritative and Sacramental Ministry." Among its dangers is that of formalism and of apathy. Churchmen, like most persons in possession, are more apathetic than those in aggression. Dissent represents emotional and experimental individualism in thought and action.

Let there be no foolish or superficial reasons for considering ourselves "Church or Chapel." No one ought to say, "I am a Churchman because I like the services," or because "I like Mr. So and So," or because, "I married a Churchwoman," or because

‘my parents were before me,’ or because “I like to belong to the establishment.” With regard to this last, suppose for the sake of argument the Salvation Army (because of the good they have done and are doing, and of the wide extent of their wonderful organization) were to become the established form of religion in England, a Churchman could not accept a teaching which overthrows the Sacraments and the Ministry. We may say then at the outset, in the words of a revered Dissenter,¹ “A Church, whatever its constitution, is pretty sure sooner or later to insist on the carrying out of its own principles within its own borders, and even if that should result in the separation from it of some of its members, it is not, therefore, to be condemned as lacking in Christian charity or justice, unless it takes a still further step and insists that expulsion from its fellowship is exclusion from the Kingdom of God.”

“There will come a time,” said Richard Hooker, “when three words uttered with charity and meekness shall receive a far more blessed reward than three thousand volumes written in disdainful sharpness of wit.”

Let this be the spirit of our enquiry.

¹ Dr. Guinness Rogers, “The Unchanging Faith,” p. 25.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. WHY I AM A CATHOLIC CHURCHMAN ..	13
II. WHY I AM NOT A ROMAN CATHOLIC ..	61
III. WHY I AM NOT A DISSENTER ..	119
IV. WHAT IS A HIGH, A LOW, A BROAD CHURCHMAN? ..	143
V. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AS BY LAW ESTABLISHED; THE ORIGIN OF ENDOWMENT AND OF TITHES ..	176
VI. DISESTABLISHMENT AND DISENDOW- MENT ..	208
VII. CHURCH REFORM ..	226
VIII. REUNION ..	257
BIBLIOGRAPHY ..	278
INDEX ..	288

Church or Sect.

CHAPTER I.

WHY I AM A CATHOLIC CHURCHMAN.

Catholic.

WE must be careful to avoid the current misunderstandings and suspicions that surround the word Catholic. When referring to the Roman Church, we should give it its distinctive and official title of the "Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church," as endorsed by the Vatican Council ¹ and as found in the Creed drawn up at the Council of Trent.

It may perhaps be asked, Why use a word which is so greatly misunderstood? Because we wish to clear it of misunderstanding, and because it is so constantly used in our Book of Common Prayer. In the Apostles' Creed we say, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," in the Nicene Creed, "One Catholic and Apostolic Church," and in the Athanasian, "This

¹ The Creed of Pope Pius IV., which every convert must profess, reads: "I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all Churches, and swear obedience to the Roman Bishop, the successor of S. Peter."

is the Catholic faith." The Prayer "for all sorts and conditions of men" prays for "the good estate of the Catholic Church." The Catholic Epistles are so called because they are general and not local, and are so named by Eusebius because they were written "not to one nation, but to every nation in general."¹ The Roman Catholic Church has no claim to the exclusive use of the term, for the Eastern Church is the lineal inheritor of the Greek Fathers, and for this reason we appeal beyond Rome to the ancient and undivided Church.

It is not long ago that the Government of India laid it down that the term "Catholic" must not be used officially as synonymous with "Roman Catholic."

It is therefore correct and polite to distinguish the Catholicity of the Roman Catholics by the qualification they have themselves chosen. We deprecate the use of the word "Catholic" exclusively by one "party" in our own Church, even as we repudiate the title of "Non-Catholic" sometimes applied to the Church of England by the Roman Catholics.²

The word "Catholic" traces its descent to the first century, and was used by Ignatius,³ who died about A.D. 110. It is a term of extraordinary dignity, and in the mind of S. Paul signifies a grand comprehensive brotherhood of Jew and Gentile, bond and free, in contradistinction to the Jewish

¹ "Ecclesiastical History," vi. 25.

² See the *Guardian*, February 21, 1913.

³ Ep. ad. Smyrn., viii. Migne. Pat. Gr. v., Col. 852.

Church, which was narrow and exclusive, and to Calvinism, which confines the Church to a select few. The "middle wall of partition" has been broken down. The Church is universal, not because all men belong to it, but because it is *for* all men if not *of* all men. From the early part of the second century Catholic is used in the two senses (1) of universality and (2) of orthodoxy, as Cyril of Jerusalem in A.D. 348 testifies.¹ It has more recently assumed subordinate and subsidiary meanings. Since Christianity is now so much divided, it is legitimate to say that the word now signifies a particular view of Christianity, and is applied to the ecclesiastical, ceremonial, sacramental, and mediatorial faith as held by the Eastern, Anglican (excluding the Papal claim), and Roman Catholic Churches. It further means, with reference to the Church of England, that she claims to be part of a wider and greater whole.

The term is found almost invariably in the Creeds of the Eastern Church.

The text of Catholic truth is given by S. Vincent of Lerins in A.D. 434,² and the word is similarly used by S. Ambrose in A.D. 397. It is not used in the Bible, but we must bear in mind that in the

¹ "The Church is called Catholic because it extends throughout all the world, and because it teaches universally and completely all the doctrines which ought to come to the knowledge of men concerning things visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly."

² "In the Catholic Church herself care must be taken that we hold that which has been believed always, everywhere, and by all."

New Testament the local Church or Congregation is naturally more in evidence than the universal Church, but the Church is certainly more than a single congregation ; for we read of " the Church, throughout all Judæa, and Galilee, and Samaria." ¹

Protestant.

Church-people sometimes say, " We belong to the Protestant Church, and so we want all our fellow-members to use this word, and to give up calling themselves Catholics." We may reply that the word " Protestant " is not in the Bible, and, further, it is not in the Prayer Book, or the thirty-nine articles, or in the Canons or Homilies. It is modern, for it is less than four hundred years old, and it is un-English, for it was " made in Germany." It is a very inadequate description of the Church of England, and there is a great deal in Lord Hugh Cecil's objection to it when he says, " Supposing you were to tell a foreigner that the name of your Church is ' The Protestant Reformed,' you would convey to his mind that the Church of England disagreed with somebody, and once had been worse than it is."

The word " Protestant " was first applied, in A.D. 1529, to the Lutherans, who protested against a decree of the Emperor Charles V. revoking decrees of the Diet of Speyer in A.D. 1526, which favoured Lutheranism. The Papal Party refused to allow

¹ Acts ix. 31.

the German princes to have their own private worship, and the latter replied : " If you do not yield to our request, we protest before God and all men that we neither consent nor adhere in any way to the proposed decree." Shortly after the word was applied to the Reformers at Augsburg, and was gradually given to all who opposed the Roman claims. Historically, therefore, it belongs to the Lutheran denomination in Germany, which in process of reformation, however, departed from Catholic faith and practice.

Words must be used in the sense and only in that sense in which at the time of their use they are generally understood. When a seventeenth century Churchman called himself a Protestant, he used the word in a restricted significance, and the Protestant religion then meant the religion of the Church of England. In 1661 the Bishops objected to the word and declared that Protestants were those who professed the Augsburg Confession.

In a restricted sense we Churchmen are Protestants still, but to-day all the sects pride themselves upon their Protestantism, but since many of them overthrow the Ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, Confirmation and Infant Baptism, we refuse to call ourselves Protestants except in this restricted sense that we protest against the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the Pope. It is in this connection that the word is used in the Coronation Service, which is not, however, part of our Prayer Book, and never received the sanction of Convoca-

tion. The title of Protestant was given to the Church in an Act of Parliament when, at the coronation of William III. and Mary, in 1689, a new coronation oath was framed in which the king had to swear to maintain "The Protestant reformed Religion established by law."¹

The Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury declined to concur in an address to the Crown, in which the word occurred, because it was "equivocal, since Socinians, Anabaptists, and Quakers assumed the title," and "lest the Church of England should suffer diminution in being joined with foreign Protestant churches." Since that time, the word has never been used in any official document. Until the coronation of William and Mary the oath had been to maintain "the true profession of the Gospel established in the Kingdom." James II., though a Roman Catholic, took the oath in the usual form. It was necessary to protect the true character of the established Church in the future, and there was only the one word that had never been used for one in communion with the Pope; and it was then used,

¹ It should be noted that the oath does not refer to the Protestant *Church*, and it is well to remember that even the most doctrinal words in the Declaration, which has been in use for more than two hundred years, were put there primarily to safeguard the political loyalty of the people, and were therefore more political than religious. The Secret Treaty of Dover, in 1670, the negotiations of Charles II. with Louis XIV, the king's secret undertakings to the Church of Rome and to his own Parliament, and the knowledge that many public men were implicated, made Parliament and the people determine that they would impose first on public servants, and a few years later on Parliament, and finally on the King, a test more binding than a mere promise, and quite incompatible with membership of the Roman Church.

not as being opposed to Catholic, but as excluding a Papist ; but in the same service the king receives the ring " in defence of the Catholic Faith."

It was an unqualified pleasure to almost everybody when, by Act of Parliament, in 1910 the very objectionable words were removed which for so long caused offence to the Roman Catholic subjects of the king, and His Majesty now professes, testifies, and declares that " I am a faithful Protestant, and will, according to the true intent of the enactments, which secure the Protestant succession to the throne of my realm, uphold and maintain them to the best of my powers according to law." The proposed amendment originally suggested that the words should be " The Protestant Reformed Church as by law established in England," but as this sentence " bristled with false theology and bad history " it was omitted. It would have given by statute a new designation to the Church of England which would have been neither distinctive nor exclusive, as the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Randall Davidson, pointed out in the House of Lords when the second reading of the Bill was discussed.

Protest is not faith, and Churchmen have something more to do than merely to protest against error. They have a faith to declare and maintain, and are not required to repeat as part of their creed " I believe in the Holy Protestant Church." They reject the term because it is not in the Bible, and is not primitive ; it is misleading and capable

of misinterpretation, in that it may connote opponents of the Church, which differs vitally from the Protestant sects. The Protestantism of the Church of England maintains Catholic faith and practice, as a well known Unitarian testifies.¹ As Catholics we are "the heirs of the ages," and it is our claim that we maintain "the faith once for all delivered to the saints."

Does the Church of England date from the Time of Henry VIII.?

It is often said even to-day that the Church of England is a sect dating only from the Reformation. Confusion has probably arisen from the sending of Augustine, which some think means that the Roman Catholic Church was the established Church until the Reformation, when the Church of England came into being as distinct from the Church of Rome. This is, indeed, to give away our whole position to the Roman Catholics, making them the Catholic Church and ourselves one of the sects.

Continuity.

We shall have opportunity later on to consider the continuity of the Church, as judged by her teaching,

¹ Dr. Martineau, "Studies of Christianity," 1890: "In its origin and earliest traditions, in the basis of its constitution and worship, the Church of England has nothing whatever to do with Protestantism. Authoritative doctrine, sacramental grace, sacerdotal mediation are all retained . . . the impelling and regulative idea of the whole change (at the Reformation) was that of a nationalization of Catholicism."

and meantime we may repeat some useful words which show that the Church of England is "no more a branch of the Church of Rome, because founded by the missionaries from Rome, than the Church of Rome is a branch of the Eastern Church, because founded by missionaries from Jerusalem, which is the mother of us all." ¹ Gregory's own words, in his letter to Augustine, do not convey any impression that he desired to create a branch of his own Church in England. We readily admit that the Church of England was in union with Rome right up to the sixteenth century. So long as "the faith once for all delivered to the saints" was held and taught, the union was natural. It was when the Roman Church began to make more and more claims of supremacy that these were repudiated. This supremacy was not exercised before the Conquest. "The interference of foreign Churches was scarcely if at all felt." ² "Down to the Norman Conquest we are not practically concerned with the papacy at all." ³

We are well aware that, later on, the Bishop of Rome made appointments to English Bishoprics, and sent Legates to England. It is quite true that Archbishops received the pall from Rome, but it cannot be maintained that this was a mark of jurisdiction. If it be argued that Peter's pence was paid to Rome,

¹ Rev. H. J. Clayton, "Some Notes of the Church of England," p. 23.

² Stubbs, "Constitutional History," I. p. 267.

³ Collins, "Church and State in England Before the Conquest," p. 8.

right up to the sixteenth century, it was not a compulsory offering. Professor Freeman is not likely to be regarded as a prejudiced authority, and we may recall some well-known words of his when he states the view that "The facts of history compel us to assume the absolute identity of the Church of England after the Reformation with the Church of England before the Reformation." Similar testimony is given by Mr. Asquith when he said, "I am not one of those who think that the legislation of Henry VIII. transferred the privileges and endowments of a National establishment from the Church of Rome to the Church of England. I believe that view rests upon imperfect historical information. I am quite prepared to admit what I believe the best authorities of history now assert that there has been amidst all these changes and developments a substantial identity and continuity of existence in our national Church from earliest history down to the present time." ¹ It would be true to say that this continuity was the first principle of the Reformation. The Church of England not only reclaimed her ancient rights as a national and Catholic Church, but maintained the same faith, and held to her apostolic succession. No new ecclesiastical body was set up in England, for the same Bishops retained their Sees, and the same Deans, Archdeacons, and Canons continued in their several positions. The same Liturgy was in use in Cathedrals and Parish Churches. Parliament even enforced transubstan-

¹ Speech in the House of Commons, March 21, 1895.

tiation in A.D. 1539 as a test of orthodoxy, and the "King's Book" of A.D. 1543 taught the seven sacraments. The Prayer Book of A.D. 1549 continued to describe Holy Communion as "Commonly called the Mass." There were two distinct parties in post-Reformation Protestantism. The Church of England remained true, as we have already said, to Catholic faith and practice, but an examination of Luther's teaching will quickly show that he deviated from them considerably. It is true that he was quite Catholic in his view of the Pope's position, for he said: "If I acknowledge in the Pope, the sole right of governing in the Church, I must as a consequence of this admission, treat as so many heretics Augustine, Athanasius, Cyprian, Gregory, and all the Bishops of the East, none of these having been initiated by him or under him."¹ But not only did he introduce the doctrine of free justification, but also his idea of episcopacy and ordination was far removed from Catholicity, as will be seen from these words: "If the Bishops discharged their own office aright, and took care of the Church and Gospel, it might be permitted them, not of necessity, but in the name of charity and tranquillity, to ordain and confirm our ministers. . . . The Church is not to be deserted nor despoiled of ministers through their fault. Wherefore, as old examples of the Church and Fathers teach us, we ourselves ought and will to ordain fit persons to this office. Since, of Divine right, the degrees of

¹ Letter to Jerome Dungenheims, 1591.

Bishop and Pastor are not different, it is manifest that an ordination made by a Pastor in his own Church is valid." ¹

Holding the view that all are consecrated priests by baptism, he naturally rejected the idea of Apostolic Succession.

When Dissenters lose no opportunity of stating that the Church of England came into being during the reign of Henry VIII. they are, presumably, anxious to show that on the grounds of antiquity they can claim as much as the Church. Do they make this claim as controversialists, and not as historians? We have already said that the guiding principle of the Reformation was an appeal to antiquity. The Church of England makes that same appeal to-day, in protest against and to disprove the modern developments of Roman Catholic doctrine. Will Protestant Dissent give away the whole case? If the Church of England did not exist till the sixteenth century, then indeed the Church of Rome "holds the field."

We maintain that the Church of England had an independent existence for a thousand years prior to the Reformation, for she was represented at the Council of Arles in A.D. 314 by the Bishops of London, York, and Caerleon (Lincoln), with a Priest and Deacon. It was not until A.D. 597 that the Bishop of Rome sent Augustine to England, and he actually held a conference with the British Bishops on the banks of the

¹ Articles of Schmalkalden, 1537.

Severn, and they refused to acknowledge his authority.

The Convocations of Canterbury and York in A.D. 1534 decreed "that the Bishop of Rome hath no greater jurisdiction over this country than any other foreign Bishop." When, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the Roman Church declared "He that reigneth on High, hath committed the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church . . . to one alone upon earth, namely to Peter's successor, the Roman Pontiff," and when the Pope in accordance with this assertion excommunicated the queen as a heretic, and deprived her of her right to the crown, it was time for England to stand by her queen. Those who obeyed the Pope split off as Papists in A.D. 1581. If it be maintained that Henry VIII. made himself, in A.D. 1534, the head of the Church, in the place of the Pope, and that Queen Elizabeth gave it a changed body in A.D. 1562 in the thirty-nine articles, and that Edward VI. gave it a new constitution in the Prayer Book of A.D. 1549, and Charles II. by the Act of Uniformity in 1662, we should reply that the theory of continuity is not touched by these changes. It is doctrine that must decide. No Dissenting sect that has no continuity of name, and lacks the Historic Episcopate, Confirmation, Infant Baptism, and the Sacrament of Holy Communion, and the Catholic creeds can make any adequate appeal to antiquity, and if such Sect condemns the Roman Catholic Church for the promulgation of modern doctrines, it must also

condemn itself for the overthrow of ancient teaching. If the modern Dissenter justifies a breaking away from the old faith, it at the same time removes the objection constantly urged against the "developments" of Rome. There was never a time since Christianity was introduced into England when the threefold ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons did not exist in the Church of England. We have continuous history behind us ; we go right back to the New Testament. There we read that Christians "continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of the bread and in the prayers."¹ What was this "doctrine of the Apostles"? Is it followed to-day by the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church? The answer to these two questions explains and strengthens the reason why I am a Catholic Churchman. Let us make our appeal then to the Scriptures. There is no sounder basis on which to build.

The Threefold Ministry.

First of all, Jesus Christ chose twelve. These He commanded to "go and teach all nations, baptizing them."² If this commission was meant for them only, what did our Lord mean when He added : "Lo ! I am with you all the days, even to the end of the 'world' "?³ The twelve Apostles did not live long beyond the allotted span of human life, and while they lived they could not undertake all the work, for converts were drawn in as they

¹ Acts ii. 42.

² S. Matthew xxviii. 19, 20.

³ Ibid.

went further afield. It was necessary to appoint assistants.¹ In the constitution of the Jewish Church there were High Priest, Priests and Levites. What more natural than to use this arrangement as a model?

Deacons.

We read in the New Testament that the Apostles chose seven Deacons,² to whom special work was allotted. They were to distribute alms,³ to preach,⁴ to baptize.⁵ How were they appointed? When they had prayed, they laid their hands on them.⁶ If we look at the Service for the Ordination of Deacon in the Prayer Book we shall see that the Bishop lays his hands on the candidates and ordains them to the Diaconate. They serve for a year, and are then ordained to the Priesthood.

Priests.

When we look for the appointment by the Apostles of the order of Elders or Presbyters, we find these words in the New Testament: "They ordained them Elders in every Church."⁷ We find

¹ Clement of Rome (first century) says: "Our Apostles gave directions in what manner other chosen men, when they should have fallen asleep in death, should succeed them.—Ep ad Cor., Section 44.

² Acts vi. 5.

³ Acts vi. 1.

⁴ Ibid. viii. 5.

⁵ Ibid. viii. 38.

⁶ Ibid. vi. 6.

⁷ Ibid. xiv. 23, and Titus i. 5. The word here translated "ordained" is *χειροτονήσαντες*, which literally means "stretching out the hands," and some hold that this signifies "Appointment by voting." Perhaps both meanings are included, an election by believers "show of hands" and an ordination by "laying on of hands."

these at work in several places : " The Apostles and Elders came together to consider this matter " (of circumcision) ; ¹ " From Militus he sent to Ephesus, and called the Elders of the Church " ; ² " All the Elders were present." ³

In the " Ordering of Priests " in our Prayer Book the Bishop, with the Priests present, shall lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth the order of Priesthood. This is in accordance with S. Paul's instructions to Timothy : " The gift that was given thee by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery." ⁴

Bishops.

In choosing others to carry on their work the Apostles appointed some of the Elders as Overseers, or Episcopoi, from which the words Episcopal and Episcopacy are derived. It is probable that they were not of higher rank at this period, but they certainly had superior functions, for S. Paul instructs Timothy to " lay hands, suddenly, on no man," ⁵ and says elsewhere, ⁶ " The things thou hast heard of me, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also " ; and he writes to Titus, " I left thee in Crete that thou shouldst ordain Elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." ⁷ The order of Bishops, as we now understand the office, was a gradual process,

¹ Acts xv. 6.

² Ibid. xx. 17.

³ Ibid. xxi. 18.

⁴ 1 Tim. iv. 14.

⁵ Ibid. v. 22.

⁶ Ibid. ii. 2.

⁷ Titus i. 5.

but the Church of England appeals to the system of government which prevailed in both the Eastern and Western Church from the second to the fifteenth century, in proof of her claim to historical continuity. The Reformers made this appeal to antiquity, in A.D. 1552, when they said, "It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostolic times there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons by public prayer, with imposition of hands, approved . . . and admitted thereunto by lawful authority. No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, hereunto, according to the form hereafter following."¹ The "Ember" Prayer asks guidance for the Bishop, that, in the very words of the New Testament, "they may lay hands suddenly on no man," and wisely make choice of fit persons to serve in the sacred ministry.

It must suffice to quote from a few of the "ancient authors" to whom the Reformers made reference. Early in the second century Ignatius writes: "Without these three Orders, no church has a title to the name;"² and again he tells us that Bishops were established "in the farthest parts of the

¹ Preface to the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.

² Ad. Trall. 3.

earth,"¹ and that the Episcopate was based "on the ordinances of the Apostles,"² and "there is one altar, as there is one Bishop, with the Presbyters and Deacons."³

At the end of the same century the Canons of Hippolytus direct that "when a Bishop is made, one of the Bishops and Priests is to lay hands on him, with prayer, and then he is to be enthroned. When a Presbyter is ordained, all things shall be done unto him as in the case of the Bishop, saving that he shall not sit in the seat. And the same prayer shall be prayed over him as over the Bishop, with the sole exception of the name of the Episcopate. . . . For the Bishop is to be considered in all things equal to a Presbyter, except in the name of the throne and in the matter of ordination, because the power of ordaining is not given to him." This shows the gradual separation, in office, of the Bishop from the Presbyter.

Quite early in the third century Tertullian writes: "We have the Churches which have John for their teacher. The series of Bishops, if taken back to its origin, will rest on his authorization."⁴ He challenges Gnostic Heretics to "unfold the roll of their Bishops, so coming down in succession that their first Bishop had for his ordainer some one of the Apostles, or Apostolic men."⁵

In the words of Gibbon, "'No Church without a Bishop' has been a fact as well as a maxim since

¹ Ad. Eph. 3.

² Ad. Trall. 7.

³ Ad. Philad. x. sects. 3, 4.

⁴ Ad. Marc. iv. 5.

⁵ De Praesc. 32.

the time of Tertullian and Irenæus." ¹ A modern authority says, "Episcopacy is so inseparably interwoven with all the traditions and beliefs of men like Irenæus and Tertullian that they betray no knowledge of a time when it was not." ² An important question then arises: Is this Apostolic ministry vital to the perpetuation of the Faith?

Is Episcopacy the "esse" or "bene esse" of the Church?

In other words, is Episcopacy, the "esse," essential, or is it only the "bene esse," or well-being, of the Church, not essential, and to be given up in the interests of expediency or of reunion? In days gone by, the matter was not considered arguable. Episcopacy was regarded as undoubtedly essential. To-day, light from fresh documents and a study of the facts, together with a greater desire for unity, have altered the position considerably, and in the words of the late Professor W. E. Collins, "it may conceivably be that there is sufficient evidence for changing any practice, however venerable, unless by so doing we should imperil vital truth" ³ and he proceeds to say that, looking at the facts then, it is certain (1) that a definite ministry existed in the Christian Church from the beginning; (2) it existed as an organ of the Church "for the perfecting of the saints unto the work of ministry; (3) it

¹ "History of the Roman Empire," vol. I. p. 288, note 5.

² Lightfoot, "Dissert.," p. 227.

³ "Sermons on Critical Questions." No. II. "Episcopacy."

is from above and not from below. The choice of the people does not make the minister, but the call comes from God ; " no man taketh this honour except he be called " ; and (4) the ministry is very complex : " He gave some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some teachers." At the beginning, prophets are very important, and, according to the " Didache,"¹ above the Bishops and Deacons, but in the " Shepherd of Hermas " ² they are below the Presbyters or Elders. The order of prophets, like miracles and gifts of healing, gradually ceased to exist.³ The growth of the individual Bishop is gradual, but " the orderly transmission of ministry for those who have already received it, and who were authorized to convey it, is the only system that as a system has ever prevailed at all times." This is the essence of Episcopalianism. We must be careful to safeguard our own interests, rather than to deny the gifts of others. The Apostolic succession is a fact, not a theory. At the very beginning of the Christian Church there were exceptional cases, but the times were exceptional, yet transmission of ministry by those who had received it remained, and continued through the centuries, and still continues. It is therefore a historic ministry. Episcopacy is not merely the matter of a particular form of Church government. It means

¹ " The teaching " of the Apostles, a long lost sub-Apostolic writing, rediscovered by Bryennios, and published in 1883.

² Hermas was an Apostolic Father. His work has been called the Pilgrim's Progress of the Early Church.

³ Prof. Collins.

more than a threefold ministry. Episcopacy is "a channel of the grace of ministry," and to us Churchmen, at least, it is essential, *i.e.* of the "esse" of the Church.¹

Regarded by Dissent as "bene esse."

That it is of the "bene esse" of the Church is being more and more widely held in modern days. A Methodist Episcopal Church flourishes in America, but the Bishops are merely superintendents, and do not claim Apostolic succession. At the Free Church Congress at Norwich, Rev. J. H. Shakespeare read a paper on "Unity," in which he expressed the hope to see in his lifetime England divided into Free Church Dioceses with Free Church Bishops, or, if the term is judged objectionable, general superintendents. He declares that "Episcopacy is in the New Testament." The late Rev. H. Price Hughes was strongly in favour of Wesleyan Bishops. The Rev. J. D. Jones, of Bournemouth, Ex-President of the Congregational Union, writing in his Church Magazine, said: "What is wanted is a man possessed of the confidence of his brethren, who shall act as a General Superintendent of the churches in a given area, and as a Father in God to the ministers"; and he adds: "I sympathize with the proposal for at least two reasons—(1) It approximates to New Testament practice. The New Testament method was not mere Congre-

¹ I have made abundant use in the foregoing sentences of Professor Collins' sermon.

gationalism. It was that plus Apostolic oversight. I am persuaded it would be to the advantage of our Congregational Churches if that element of oversight could be restored. And (2) I think that such a modified Episcopacy would prove practically useful."

At the same Congress, Principal Forsyth read a paper on "The Effectiveness of the Ministry," and he asked the question: "Are your churches in an equal light with Rome or Anglicanism?" He proceeded to declare that "the ministry is a sacramental office."

Is Sacramental Grace only through Episcopacy?

It must be ascertained then whether we are right or wrong in saying that sacramental grace is given only through Episcopal orders. The nature and degree of the sanction of Episcopacy must be carefully examined, especially since there is an ever-growing belief that the prophetic is as indispensable an element in the Church as the priestly. The history of the prophetic order must be studied. It is a charismatic ministry without the sanction of ordination.

As we have already seen, the Preface to the Ordinal expressly declares that the Church of England is strictly Episcopalian, but is it not possible that Articles 19 and 23¹ were drawn up to include non-Episcopal Churches?

¹ Article 19. The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached

At any rate, it is, of course, maintained by some Dissenters that so long as a man believes in and loves Jesus Christ, and is a good living man, there is no reason why he should not perform the same functions as the clergy; but there is great danger as well as innovation in the present-day fact that any man may take upon himself the functions of the ministry. We have no right, however, to say that the Holy Spirit cannot act outside the system of the laying on of hands in ordination. Many men are richly endowed with special gifts of the Holy Spirit, but the Apostles did not dispense with the regular order of the Church even in such cases. The principle of external ordination is manifested in the call of S. Paul, who received his apostleship direct from the Lord, and yet was set apart for his work among the Gentiles by the laying on of hands, with fasting and prayer. Perhaps in the days to come there will be some adjustment on the one side, a fuller recognition of a charismatic ministry, and on the other a greater realization of the value of Episcopacy. Churchmen may have been slow to recognize the signs of Apostleship in others. May not those who believed themselves of

and the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

Article 23. It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send ministers unto the Lord's Vineyard.

God be willing to receive a commission by outward sign? Churchmen cannot compromise by surrendering an Apostolic order retained not only by the Roman Church, but also by the Churches of the East. This explains why Dissenting ministers may not officiate at our altars. It is not a matter of character, but of Church order, and indeed it was this that John Wesley had in mind when he asked his preachers in 1789, "Did we ever appoint you to administer Sacraments, and to exercise the Priestly office?" and answered his own question by saying, "Such an idea never entered our minds. We believe it would not be right for us to administer either Baptism or the Lord's Supper unless we had a commission from Bishops to do so."

Confirmation.

The Bible calls the "laying on of hands" nothing less than "the doctrine (*i.e.* teaching) of Christ."¹ We have at least two accounts of the administration of this rite in the New Testament.² It provides a great opportunity for young men and women formally to make public profession of their loyalty to Christ and His Church. All denominations alike deplore the difficulty of keeping the young within the influence of their place of worship just at the time when they are leaving Sunday school, and just because they are then at an impressionable age, such a service as Confirmation can make and

¹ Heb. vi. 1.

² Acts viii. and xix.

leave a permanent impression for good. It is a great gain to mark the crisis in the life of the young by a religious rite. It is worth recording that this very point was emphasized when the question of introducing Confirmation for the Methodists was raised and discussed. "What is wanted is some service suitably prepared for, some act of Consecration such as that which the Church of England calls Confirmation."¹ Another eminent Dissenter says: "We have made a great mistake in dropping Confirmation, or in not treating the entry of membership in a like solemn way."² This idea may yet spread among the Dissenting sects. Meantime it does seem remarkable that they have hitherto ignored a rite which has Biblical authority. The laying on of hands was among the Jews a traditional action, which accompanied solemn prayer and blessing, and was adopted by the Christian Church in many different circumstances.³ At the age of twelve a Jewish boy is made "a son of the Law." The Christian boy and girl are confirmed. No one can reasonably find fault with us when we teach that the Holy Spirit is given by "the laying on of hands." It is so recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, and this teaching has been continuously handed on through the centuries. Perhaps too much prominence has been given to the renewal of Baptismal vows that is made at Confirmation,

¹ Rev. A. H. Walker, Wesleyan Conference, 1911.

² Dr. Forsyth, "The Church and the Sacraments."

³ Acts vi. 6; xiii. 3; ix. 12; viii. 17; xix. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 14; v. 22; Mark xvi. 18.

for this renewal is really no part of the rite, and is only by accident, so to speak, in the service, and only then since the seventeenth century. The present introductory exhortation was formerly part of a rubric or direction, in which children were asked to renew their vows, and this has led to the misunderstanding that the rite is a renewal and nothing more. On this account it has been suggested that it would be a great help to a right understanding if the renewal of promises were made on one day, and "the laying on of hands," to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, on another. The Reformers fixed Confirmation at an age when "years of discretion" had been reached, and combined with the rite the ratification of Baptismal vows. For this purpose the Catechism was introduced into the service, but was removed to its present position in the Prayer Book in 1661, and the question, "Do ye now renew the solemn vow and promise that was made in your name at your Baptism?" was added.

We are adversely criticized because we refuse to allow members of other denominations to come to Holy Communion until they have been or are ready to be confirmed. But it is no crime to be loyal to our rules. We have some centuries of obligation behind us, for this regulation is at least as old as Archbishop Peckham's Constitutions of 1281.¹

¹ Statuimus quod nullus ad Sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis Domini admittatur extra articulum mortis nisi fuerit Confirmatus vel nisi a receptione confirmationis rationabiliter fuit impeditus. We have decreed that no one shall be admitted

The word "Confirmation" was not used prior to the fifth century, and it was probably suggested by the Vulgate translation of the words of S. Paul: "Now He that stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God."¹ The Prayer Book uses both titles, "The Order of Confirmation or Laying on of Hands." In the Eastern Church the Priest confirms, and this was the case also in parts of the West, especially in Gaul, but from the time of Pope Innocent I. (A.D. 402-417) the Bishop administered the rite. The Holy Spirit is given both at Baptism and Confirmation,² and in the early Church the two rites were regarded as inseparable, the interval between them being very short, but practical difficulties tended to increase the interval gradually, and especially in Western Europe, through the negligence or the secular engagements of the Bishop . . . It was not until the thirteenth century that the two ordinances were permanently separated, and a period of from seven to twelve years allowed to intervene.³ The gift of Confirmation is given to one who formerly received the Holy Spirit unconsciously, and now comes forward looking for the gift and expecting to receive it. There are two aspects of Baptism—the

to the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord, except at the time of death, unless he shall have been confirmed, or unless he has been reasonably prevented from the reception of confirmation.

¹ 2 Cor. i. 21: He that confirmeth us with you in Christ, and anointed us, is God.

² See Acts ii. 38, and the service for Public Baptism.

³ Plumtre in "Dictionary of Antiquities," "Confirmation."

putting off the old nature and the putting on the new, so the "laying on of hands" was added to the "washing," and thus the "birth by Water and the Spirit" was emphasized. This laying on of hands as the complement of Baptism is mentioned as early as the end of the second century by Tertullian, who says: "Having come out of the bath, we are anointed thoroughly with the blessed Unction, and after this the hand is laid upon us, inviting the Holy Spirit through the Blessing."¹ The Eastern Church makes little mention of "the laying on of hands," since Unction was given as the symbol of the Holy Spirit.

In the words of Hooker: "Grace is infused into Christian men by degrees; planted in them at the first by Baptism, after, cherished, watered, and strengthened as by other virtuous offices which piety and true religion teacheth, even so by this very special benediction whereof we speak, the rite or ceremony of Confirmation."

Baptism.

The doctrine of an invisible Church seems now to have been abandoned by practically all scholars, as without any foundation in the New Testament. There is no membership of Christ apart from membership in the visible Society founded by Him. The act which symbolized personal membership in Christ was a baptism into the visible Society.

¹ Of Baptism viii.

We may not say that the multitude which knows not on earth the name of Christ will not be members of His Family in heaven, but we can say there is no detached Discipleship in the New Testament.

Infant Baptism.

Churchmen believe in the Baptism of Infants. Let it be said at once that there is no specific and direct command to baptize such, and no absolutely clear example of an infant baptism. This is not strange, for the New Testament describes only the first few years of the early Christian Church, and the baptism and conversion of adults would be the first and most natural step, but it was evidently the custom for all the members of a household to follow the example of the head of it.¹ If there was ever any question raised against infant baptism, no trace of it is left in extant literature of Apostolic times. Indeed, there is testimony in favour of it. For more than a thousand years after the death of Jesus Christ no society of men denied this rite to infants. Irenæus (early second Century) speaks of "baptized infants and little children." Origen, born at the end of the second century, tells us "The Church has received the tradition from the Apostles that baptism ought to be administered to infants." A Churchman believes in the doctrine of Infant Baptism, because he cannot bring himself to think that the religion of Jesus Christ is less merciful than that of

¹ Acts xvi. 15, 33 ; 1 Cor. i. 16.

Moses. God said of circumcision, "This is my Covenant."¹ The Jewish Church again gives the precedent, and the first people to undergo the rite were adults.² It was the rite of entrance into the Jewish Church for children eight days old, who were certainly unconscious of the privilege they then received. Must we say then that children under the Gospel dispensation lack a privilege enjoyed by the Jewish child? God forbid.

We maintain that baptism is the same as circumcision in its intention, for S. Paul says: "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, buried with Him in Baptism."³ Justin Martyr tells us that baptism supplies the place of circumcision and is designed for infants.

Our Saviour told His apostles to baptize all nations. The nation includes children. S. Peter said, "Repent and be baptized . . . for the promise is unto you and to your children."⁴ We read that the households were baptized.⁵ In the case of one of these households all were baptized, but we read that "Lydia believed," so that the argument for adult baptism is not in this case conclusive. The texts that favour infant baptism are more than those which seem to disfavour it. Some who disagree with the baptism of infants have quoted the text, "Except a *man* be born again," laying emphasis on the word "man," but an apt rejoinder to such an

¹ Gen. xvii. 10.

² Gen. xvii. 14, 15.

³ Colos. ii. 11.

⁴ Acts ii. 39.

⁵ Acts xvi. 15, 33.

⁶ 1 Cor. i. 16.

interpretation would be the words of S. John that a woman has joy that "a man is born into the world."¹ If it be objected that infants are incapable of receiving a grace, of which they are unconscious, or of entering into a covenant, answer may be made that, apart altogether from the Jewish precedent, children often unconsciously inherit an evil. They were unconscious, were they not, of the blessing given them by Jesus Christ when He laid His hands upon them. Opponents of Infant Baptism frequently point out that many baptized children never manifest grace in after life. That is true. Many babies born alive do not long survive. They had life, but through neglect, disease, or other cause that life is forfeit. The seed of the spiritual life also needs care and nourishment. The Baptists insist on adult baptism, and maintain that in the New Testament converts first believed and repented, and then were baptized. This is true, and it would be only natural that the first converts should be adult, as is the case in the mission field to-day, and there is no doubt that a profession of faith was required,² and it was probably a belief in the Trinity. Both in Justin Martyr's First Apology, A.D. 152, and in the Didache, it is indicated that there was preparation, instruction, baptism with water in the Threefold Name, together with a profession of faith and a vow of renuncia-

¹ S. John xvi. 21.

² Rom. x. 9; 1 Cor. xii. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 5; Philip ii. 11; 1 Tim. vi. 12.

tion. Later, in the writings of Tertullian and Cyprian, there was a similar initiation everywhere in use. Justin Martyr and Polycarp use expressions which seem to suggest that Infant Baptism had begun in Apostolic times, and it was certainly an established practice by the end of the second century.

Does Conversion do away with the Need of Baptism?

There are some who contend that, in spite of the emphasis laid upon it in the New Testament, Baptism is merely a form, and that conversion is the more important. Jesus Christ was no formalist, and conversion is not everything. This may be gathered from scriptural testimony. S. Paul was converted, and after his conversion "he arose and was baptized."¹ Some were baptized even after they had already received the Holy Ghost.² Such words as "except a man be born of water and the spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God"³ may be taken, and it is quite possible to take them, as entirely spiritual,⁴ but it is remarkable that elsewhere water and the Spirit are present, *e.g.* at the Baptism of Jesus Christ, when there is the water of Jordan, and the Dove as the Spirit;⁵ and the words to Titus are, "He saved us by the washing (bath) of regeneration and renewing of the Holy

¹ Acts ix. 18.

² Ibid. x. 47.

³ S. John iii. 5.

⁴ It is well to bear in mind, however, Hooker's words: "A most infallible rule in the exposition of the sacred scriptures is that where a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the latter is commonly the worst" (v. 59; 2).

⁵ S. Matt. iii. 16.

Ghost,"¹ If it be argued that the words of S. Matthew's Gospel were not spoken by Jesus Christ in their present form, but are really the addition of a later commentator, and we agree that some manuscripts omit the words "baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," yet the same criticism cannot be applied to the words already quoted from S. John.

The answer to the question of the Catechism, "What is Baptism?" has been challenged as unscriptural when it says, "Holy Baptism is the first Christian Sacrament; it cleanses from original sin, and makes us members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven."

The Significance of Baptism.

Is it difficult to find the significance of Christian Baptism? People and things are cleansed by washing, and ceremonial uncleanness was removed by washing.² Thus Jewish converts from heathenism were baptized, and the incorporation was spoken of as "a new birth." S. Paul therefore refers to the old covenant. The passage of the Red Sea was symbolic of an old life of slavery left behind, and of a new life and new covenant begun.³ Baptism is the "bath of regeneration."⁴ We find, too, the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins in Christian Baptism in the text, which declares, "We were buried with Christ through baptism into death, that we

¹ Titus iii. 5; cp. 1 Peter iii. 21: "Baptism doth now save us."

² Numb. xix. 11. ³ 1 Cor. x. 1. ⁴ Titus iii. 5.

might walk in newness of life." The Prayer Book teaches regeneration: "Seeing that this child is regenerate," "We give Thee hearty thanks that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant"¹ Conversion and regeneration are not synonymous terms. The word "conversion" only occurs once in the Bible.² The words "convert" and "converted" occur often in the Authorized Version, but in the Revised Version they are, with one exception, translated "turn" and "be turned." The word "regeneration" only occurs twice,³ and in one of these cases it is used in connection with Baptism.

Generally Necessary to Salvation.

When Baptism is said to be one of the two Sacraments "generally necessary to salvation" this means in sixteenth century English "always necessary and for all, where it may be had."

Professor Beet, a well known Wesleyan, says: "By solemnly ordaining Baptism, our Lord made it obligatory on all who seek His favour, and thus made it a condition of salvation, for we cannot enjoy the smile whilst we refuse to obey His express commands!" Dr. Forsyth says: "It is our individualism that has done most to ruin the Sacrament of Baptism among us. . . . What Baptism first means is the incorporation of the baptized into the Church."⁴ No one will wish to contend that

¹ Service of Public Baptism; see also Article 27.

² Acts. xv. 3.

³ Matt. xix. 28 and Titus i. 3.

⁴ "The Church and the Sacraments."

grace is invariably tied to means, but if God may dispense with these means this is no argument that men may do so, and even God generally works by means. So also sacraments can only be channels, not sources, for "in such only as worthily receive have they a wholesome effect."¹

For the Remission of Sins.

The Nicene Creed declares belief "in one baptism for the remission of sins," even as John Baptist preached "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," and S. Peter, moved by the Holy Spirit, said "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins"; and it was said to S. Paul, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." But it is because of such words as these that the Baptists oppose the baptism of infants, and thus they base their opposition upon the Scriptures; yet we can scarcely expect to find many, or even any, instances of infant baptism recorded in the New Testament, for Christianity was at that time a new religion, and if we began to propagate a new religion to-day we should certainly seek to enrol adults first. At any rate, Baptists need not have deserted a Church that provides a service for adult Baptism.

We proceed now to consider the claim that Baptism cleanses from original sin, and makes the baptized a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven.

¹ Article 25.

Original Sin.

Even if we did not read that "in sin hath my mother conceived me,"¹ we know from experience that there is in all of us, from earliest infancy, a tendency to do what is wrong. Why should there be no way of escape? Why do we refuse to accept "an outward sign" of such escape? So early as the second century Ignatius tells us that "the ordinary way of being freed from original sin is Baptism."

We have scriptural authority for each of the statements of the Catechism definition of Baptism.

Members of Christ.

"Baptized into one body, ye are the Body of Christ, and severally members thereof";² "For as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ";³ "Having cleansed (the Church) by the laver of water . . . because we are members of His Body."⁴

Children of God.

"For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ";⁵ and John Wesley asks: "Who denies that ye were then made children of God and heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven?"

¹ Ps. li. 5.² 1 Cor. xii. 13, 27.³ Gal. iii. 27, 29.⁴ Eph. v. 25, 30.⁵ Gal. iii. 26 27.

Inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven.

"As many as have been baptized, have put on Christ . . . if ye be Christ's, then heirs";¹ and again, "He saved us by the washing of regeneration . . . that we should be made heirs."²

Sponsors.

People sometimes object to those who make promises in the name of an infant, and think that they take the sins of the children upon their shoulders. This is, of course, an erroneous idea. But it may be asked, Why should there be sponsors at all? We may answer, first, by remarking that sponsorship is as old as the second century, as also is the threefold vow. The Catechism anticipates this very question by asking, "Why then are infants baptized, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them?" They promise by their sureties. Did not the children receive a blessing from Christ through the medium of others? Baptists are inconsistent when, as in America, they enter the names of children on "A Cradle Roll." The Register of Baptisms is a better cradle roll.

The vows taken by sponsors are not legally binding on the children, but a moral obligation is laid upon them on their own behalf, and if they refuse the moral obligation, they do so at their own risk.

¹ Gal. iii. 27-29.² Titus iii. 7.

The Responsibility of Sponsorship.

We should do well to lay greater stress upon this sponsorship, which ought not to be assumed merely "to oblige a neighbour." Sponsors ought themselves to believe what they promise in a child's name. If the sponsor believes in the vows he takes, then he must keep them. If he does not believe them, he is really lying before God. It is unfortunate that so many children are baptized without any security of Christian upbringing. This is admittedly unsatisfactory. In parishes where a strong line has been taken, the results have been most encouraging,¹ and untold good can be done where a simple form is used, requesting the proposed names of the child to be baptized and the names and addresses of parents and godparents. The Sacrament of Baptism will never be honoured if people are allowed to approach it casually. There should be an end to the painful sight of men and women who habitually neglect their religious duties standing up as sponsors solemnly to make the threefold vow of renunciation, belief, and obedience, when they know, and every one else knows quite well, that they do not practise or intend to practise these things in their daily life. It would be better to baptize, and to postpone "reception in the Church," till suitable sponsors are forthcoming than indiscriminately to proceed, as is too often the custom. Some weighty and wise words may appropriately be quoted in this

¹ S. Matthew's, West Kensington, and S. Alphege, Southwark; and see Rev. C. F. Rogers' "Principles of Parish Work."

connexion: "The Sacramental gifts are valid through the Spirit's action without any effort on our part. They are God's gifts simply, but their whole effect on us depends on the degree of assimilative and appropriate effort—the degree of faith which we exercise. According to our faith it is done to us. This was the law of Christ's physical healings during His life on earth. The instrument of healing was the power or virtue which went out from His Sacred Person, but the effect in each case was dependent on the response of faith. Let us who believe profoundly in the sacraments see to it that we never let them, so far as lies in us, be spoken of or treated or used as charms. Let us give no countenance, for instance, to any use of baptism such as would allow children, who are not in immediate danger of death, to be baptized, when there is no fair prospect of their being brought up to understand the meaning of their Christian vocation—a practice, I believe, utterly contrary to fundamental Christian principles." ¹ These wise words deserve careful and earnest consideration.

When Christ laid His hands upon the little children, I cannot help thinking that the parents or friends who brought them to Him had a part to play. The babies, as S. Luke calls them, would realize nothing of what had been done to them, and if they understood they would soon have forgotten, unless their elders recalled the solemnity of the occasion to them as the years passed on.

¹ Dr. Gore, "Mission of the Church," p. 11.

Is Total Immersion Necessary?

Some years ago a Baptist minister in the United States was asked to prepare a book in defence of Baptist views.¹ He "fully believed that immersion was the only water baptism, and that it could be made so to appear to every enquirer," but in a letter to a friend he gave the result of his enquiries. He writes: "My disappointment you can imagine, when I tell you that, as I prosecuted my study of the subject, I found tower after tower of my Baptist fort tumbling down. Most laboriously did I strive to repair them. Month after month for two years did I labour to maintain my old ground, but to no avail. There were too many hard and solid facts against me. Having studied the subject through and through, on both sides, I was convinced of my error. Immersion was not the only baptism. The word 'baptize' did not mean 'immerse' in the New Testament I saw it clearly. I could not have been an honest man and continue to profess to believe what I did not believe."² We may add that S. Paul, writing to Titus on the "washing," which in the Margin of the Bible is rendered "laver," and by Luther "bath," used a word denoting a vessel, in which it would be impossible to immerse oneself.³ To a practical mind, the question of "immersion" or "sprinkling" does not seem important. The amount of water used does not

¹ Dr. Fairfield, "Letters on Baptism." Congregational and Sunday School Publishing Society, Boston, U.S.A.

² Quoted by Dr. Griffith-Thomas in the *Guardian*, Nov. 23, 1907.

³ λουτρον, Titus iii. 5.

seem of any consequence. Public baptism must be restored to its rightful place and dignity in the public services of the Church. Attention is drawn to the resolutions passed by the Canterbury House of Laymen on July 13, 1917.¹

The Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood.

This was the Saviour's last legacy to His disciples and His followers. If it be argued that it was meant only for His disciples, we may then ask why a similar commission was given to S. Paul, who urged his hearers that "as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come."² Sacred meals have always had a place

¹ "I. That this House desire to reaffirm the Resolution unanimously adopted by it on February 3rd, 1904, viz.:

"That His Grace the Archbishop be respectfully requested to take such steps as may seem best to promote the more general observance of *the substance of* the Rubrics concerning 'The Ministration of Public Baptism' which direct that 'The people are to be admonished that it is most convenient that Baptism should not be administered but on Sundays and other Holy Days, *when the most number of people come together* : as well for that the congregation there present may testify the receiving of them that be newly baptized into the number of Christ's Church; as also because in the Baptism of infants *every man present may be put in remembrance of his own profession made to God in his Baptism.*'

"And the people, with the children, must be ready at the Font, either immediately after the last Lesson at Morning Prayer, or else immediately after the last Lesson at Evening Prayer, as the Curate by his discretion shall appoint."

"II. That His Grace the Archbishop be respectfully requested to take such steps as may seem best to admonish the Faithful that it is their privilege and duty, if able to do so, to offer themselves as Sponsors, *especially for the children of their poorer or less instructed Brethren*, and to fulfil their own duty as Sponsors to see that these infants be taught all things a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health."

² 1 Cor. xi. 23, 26.

in the practice of corporate religion. We have pagan parallels in the Iliad and elsewhere. In S. Paul's teaching we have the intimate relationship of communion with the Lord's death. Mr. Spurgeon followed this teaching when he said: "It is well to explain to children the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, for this shows forth the death of Christ in symbol. I regret that the children do not often see this ordinance. Baptism and the Lord's Supper should both be placed in view of the rising generation, that they may then ask us, 'What mean ye by this?' Now, the Lord's Supper is a perennial gospel sermon, and it turns mainly on the sacrifice for sin. Let your little ones, then, see the Lord's Supper, and let them be told most clearly what it sets forth."¹

Sacraments as Emblems of Unity.

As the acts of those associated in the name of Christ they are emblems of unity. They are such from their character as rites of initiation. They are acts of unity in obeying a Divine command; they are instruments of unity, by which we are members one of another in many lands. If we examine into the conditions of the Church at Corinth we shall soon perceive that there was in it the peril of individualism, and so S. Paul lays stress upon various instruments of unity, such as a common faith, a common discipline, a mutual consideration,

¹ In "Come, ye Children,"

a sole authority. When, therefore, he speaks of the Sacrament of Communion, he shows that it is "a meal of brotherhood," for to partake of the Lord's Supper is incorporation into a fellowship, just as this idea of fellowship underlies the sacrificial ordinance of the ancient world. We shall hope, at a later stage, to deal further with this idea of "a Sacrament of Unity."

We could wish it were not true of all denominations alike that it is only the few members in each that avail themselves of the privilege of being communicants. One is sometimes tempted to think that the Holy Communion must have been meant, in the minds of people to-day, for the clergy and a few pious women of leisure, yet the first communicants were working men.

Following S. John's chronology of the Passion, the Last Supper took place before the Passover. If the Supper was the Passover, as the Synoptists suggest, then the crucifixion would have fallen on the feast day, which would have been to the Jews a great desecration of the festival. S. John says the trial took place on the "Preparation." The Last Supper may thus have been the ceremony of Kiddûsh,¹ a sanctification before the evening meal at the opening of the Sabbath and great festivals. There is then a close similarity between this and the Last Supper. Both began with a blessing of the cup, followed by a washing of hands (at the Last Supper, of the feet), then the bread was blessed.

¹ Rev. G. H. Box, "Journal of Theological Studies," III., 367.

The same order is followed in S. Paul's command to the Corinthians,¹ and in the Didache.

Catholic Churchmen by Conviction.

We are Catholic churchmen, then, by conviction, We live, as Bishop Ken died, "in the Holy Catholic Apostolic faith, more particularly in the communion of the Church of England." We give to all the right we claim from all, that each one shall consider his or her position, set aside foolish, frivolous, unworthy reasons for belonging to a Church or a sect, and bravely, resolutely, faithfully, and consistently stand by the faith he holds and professes before all men and at all costs. We have what Canon Newbolt calls "a beautiful system of grace from the cradle to the grave, and it is not religious strife to defend so precious a heritage."

Intelligent Conception Needed.

But we must rouse ourselves to a more intelligent conception of our position. We must teach, and we must learn. There is on all sides a great slackness of grip. Roman Catholics and members of other denominations know far more concerning the faith that is in them than do average Churchmen. Children are baptized indiscriminately, godparents are slack, casual, and indifferent, and are often selected for any but right reasons. The poor and unlearned need to be prompted before they can

¹ 1 Cor. x. 16.

make the responses, the well-to-do and supposedly educated regard the vows made as of little account. How many of us are able to thank God for the help given us by our sponsors?

Confirmation is something that has to be got through; "I want my child done!" Our marriage service: it is with difficulty that the officiant can get the parties to say correctly the words that the Church puts into their mouths, if they are poor and uneducated, and if the parties are well-to-do and educated the service is often a respectable convention rather than a Divine ordinance. We must realize that Baptism is the conferment on an infant of a childship of God, that Confirmation conveys a gift, that Marriage in Church is a joining together by God of two persons who come specifically to ask His blessing upon the union.

The Fulfilment of Duties.

We are slack not only in the observance of our privileges, but are woefully behindhand in the fulfilment of duties. We have not been taught to give, for we are brought up to expect everything for nothing in spiritual things. We are content to allow the incumbent to starve, or to exist upon the charity of doles and secondhand clothes. We see nothing wrong in assistant curates being paid out of the vicar's private purse or from the proceeds of a jumble sale. The ignorance of Churchmen concerning the sources and adequacy or otherwise

of the payment of their clergy is culpable; that the richest religious denomination in Europe should depend on the dead hand of the past is deplorable; that the cure of souls in a parish must be given to those who have, as first qualification, the possession of private means is wrong. It is time that we who have so long enjoyed the benefactions of the past should in our day make provision for the future. Have we a clean conscience concerning missions, and are we satisfied with the position we occupy compared with other denominations beyond the seas? Is it not true that generally speaking we are "too late"?

Brotherhood.

What about the brotherhood of the Church? In the well-known epigram "The Baptists have all the water, the Wesleyans all the fire, and the Church of England all the starch," is the criticism deserved? If so, the Church has not been faithful to the Catechism, for therein is mutual fellowship laid down. Let us examine its social teaching.¹ We are to be "in charity with all men," as "a member of Christ" and "a child of God" I am one of many. The three vows of Baptism affect the social life. The Creed, though a theological document, is full of social teaching, not least when it declares belief in the Catholic Church, which is a fellowship, and

¹ See Articles by Dr. Dearmer. *Church Times*, July 26, 1907.

in the Communion of Saints, which is brotherhood. Of the ten commandments, six refer to the duties we owe to our fellows. If we are reminded that we teach our children "to order themselves lowly and reverently to all their betters," this need not convey an impression that Churchmen are proud and superior, for the same injunction occurs in the Wesleyan and Calvinistic Methodist Catechisms.¹ Nothing more definitely inculcates brotherhood than the opening words of the Lord's Prayer. In the "one bread, one body," of which all partake, and in which are many members, there is brotherhood indeed, but we must confess with shame that we have little of it in practice.

Loose Phrases.

We are ill-instructed in the faith, and when we speak or write of the Church we are many of us lamentably given to the use of loose phrases. We talk of our sons, who are candidates for Holy Orders, as "going into the Church," when they "went into the Church" at baptism. We refer to Roman Catholics as Catholics, and so exclude ourselves from the Holy Catholic Church in which we express our belief each time we recite the Creeds. Let us aim at an intelligent Churchmanship, let us read, think out, and study our ecclesiastical position, and having found it, maintain it fearlessly, without malice and without prejudice towards those who differ from us.

¹ Wesleyan Catechism, p. 21. Calvinistic M. ditto, p. 84 (Hyffordwr).

Each man must worship God as *he* thinks right, and not as *we* think right for him; and we may well lay to heart some broadminded words of charity and toleration from one who has no misgivings whatever concerning the faith that he himself holds: "The Church is one; it has definite rules and real Sacraments and genuine tests; but it is not for us to know exactly where it leaves off, or where the last man stands who may be called a Churchman, and where one inch further afield stands the man to whom the name must be denied. That is no affair of ours, and that, not because the limit is unimportant, but because we do not desire to approach it. Why should a man know where the outside edge is? He does not want to pass it. He desires to come nearer to the centre. . . . What we have to do is to keep close to the shepherd, for then we are quite certain to be in the flock." ¹

¹ Father Waggett, quoted in the *Church Times*.

CHAPTER II.

WHY I AM NOT A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

Misconceptions.

LET us, at the outset, clear away some at least of the many misconceptions that ill-informed people entertain concerning Roman Catholics. That misconceptions exist in abundance can best be understood by the silly remarks that are so often made. "We went to a certain church, and it was just like a Catholic one," or "The vicar is almost a Catholic," and "This one is very Catholic—it has candles and lights." One is very tired too of hearing about "Romanizing clergy." In many minds there is a very hazy idea of the real differences that divide the Church of England and the Church of Rome.

Unfair Statements.

Before discussing these differences, let us disabuse ourselves of certain unfair and uncharitable statements often made against the Roman Catholics. We have no right to say that the history of nations proves the harm the Roman faith has done in Roman

Catholic countries. It would be equally true to make this charge against Protestants. This much may be said of the Roman priesthood: seldom if ever is the name and honour of a Roman priest dragged through the mud, and disgraced in our law courts, as is frequently the case with the ministers of other denominations. And whatever dislike may be expressed concerning the confessional, the morality of Roman Catholic Ireland is quite as high and possibly higher than that of so-called Protestant England.¹

Roman Catholic Steadfastness.

Testimony has been paid by one who is certainly not prejudiced in its favour to certain characteristics of Roman Catholicism, when he said, "We cannot but admire the culture and ability of many of its prelates and priests, the earnestness and piety of many of its adherents, the presence in its literature of much that is devout, the zeal and self-denial of its missionaries."² The Roman Catholics set an example of steadfast allegiance to their faith which is sadly lacking in many adherents among both Anglicans and Dissenters. They adhere loyally to their Church. Parents do not send their children

¹ Sir John Bigham once said, "I think religion has a very great effect in restraining applications for divorce. Members of the Roman Catholic Church seldom come before the court, and I attribute the fact to the great influence the priesthood has over the congregation, and to the respect which is inculcated in Roman Catholics for the marriage tie.

² Archdeacon Sinclair.

first to one Sunday school and then to another, for the sake of treats and prizes. These Roman Catholics do not wander from one church to another because they like the preacher. They do not desert their faith for that of a husband, sweetheart, or wife. They do not send their daughter to some Protestant school "because the fees are low and the education good, even if the 'atmosphere' be not just what they would prefer." They are most strict and particular, and are much to be admired for their loyalty and for their staunch convictions.

The Roman Catholic Faith nearer ours than is the Dissenter's.

It will surprise some and offend many to be told that the Roman Catholic faith is nearer to our own than is that of any of the Dissenters, and for these reasons: The Roman Catholics believe in the three orders of the Ministry—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons—tracing them back through the centuries to Apostolic times, as we do. None are admitted to exercise the functions of the ministry except by the laying on of hands by the Bishops. This is our rule. They possess the sacramental life imparted in the Sacrament of Holy Communion, and place infant baptism and confirmation in the forefront of their teaching, as we do. The Dissenters have rejected the threefold ministry and confirmation, the Baptists disown infant baptism, the Quakers and Salvationists have no Holy Communion.

Dissenters find fault with those seeking reunion with Rome, although they would not, perhaps, object to the consideration of reunion with us; but they would need to concede a good deal more than the Roman Catholics, for to the Churchman a Dissenting minister is a layman and cannot minister in our churches unless and until he has received ordination at the hands of the Bishop. A Roman Catholic priest needs no re-ordination, and a Roman Catholic communicant would not be confirmed again. It is on this account that from the Anglican point of view the Roman Church, the Greek or Eastern Church, and the Anglican Church together constitute the Catholic Church, as that phrase was known in the earliest ages of the Christian era, centuries before the Dissenters of to-day were ever heard of.

The Validity of our Ministry.

We shall be reminded that the Church of England ministry is repudiated by the Romanists, who declare us schismatics. They claim the distinctive title of "the Catholic Church," and say "separation from it is schism." They base their disbelief in the validity of our ministry upon the theory that the "form" and "intention" of our ordinal is defective, and that Bishop Barlow was himself never consecrated, but merely appointed by Henry VIII. There is no irrefutable evidence that he was never consecrated, but it is only fair also to say that there

is no actual record that he was, although the evidence of his consecration is very strong.¹ The point in disputing Barlow's consecration is that it was he who consecrated Archbishop Parker, but he was not the only consecrating Bishop. In disputing the "intention," the Roman Catholics, through the Bull of Pope Leo XIII., suggest that those who compiled the English ordinal intended to change and alter the existing ministry, but the preface to the ordinal distinctly states "to the intent these orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed," and refers to these orders having been in the Church since the time of the Apostles. It also contemplates and allows the ministration of those who "had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination." This reference to those consecrated or ordained with the old rites shows there was no alteration of "form." The Roman Catholics assert that no denomination can be Apostolic that is not in external communion with the Pope; they cannot base their assertion either upon the Scriptures or the doctrine and practice of the undivided Church.

Catholicity.

We Christians are in an unhappy state. The Romanists deny the Catholicity of the Eastern and of the Anglican Churches; the Eastern Church denies

¹ See Church Historical Society Tracts by Brightman and others, S.P.C.K.

the Catholicity of the Roman, as the Anglican denies that of the Dissenting sects. We Anglicans can at least take comfort in the reflection that whilst two great Churches claim each to be exclusively Catholic, we ourselves, a third great group, are content to affirm our own Catholicity without denying theirs.

Toleration.

Christians may well exclaim, "What a pity there is so much repudiation!" Yes, it is a pity, but we may at any rate tolerate our differences. There is no need to quarrel about them, for they should be a source of never-failing interest, and we ought to respect a convinced Dissenter, Romanist, or Anglican. The stronger the faith the greater the charity; the firmer the conviction the less the bigotry. It is not, for instance, strength of faith or greatness of charity which can express such a sentiment as the following: "The Anglican Church was established by man and Satan together; it is therefore impossible to be saved in the so-called Anglican Church. Nor is it otherwise with the Dissenters. Protestants, Dissenters, and other heretics do their own will instead of that of God, and that is the reason why salvation is impossible to them. What must we then say of those ministers who are not ordained, like those of the Church of England and other Dissenters here and elsewhere? The non-ordained minister, I repeat, is not from

God ; now guess from where he comes. ‘ Then he is from the Devil,’ you will say. ‘ You have guessed it, sir,’ I reply.”¹ And once again, “ If a man publicly professes a heretical doctrine, or attempts to pervert others by teaching or example, not only may he be excommunicated, but with justice be killed, lest by a pestilent contagion he cause many to be lost, for a wicked man is more harmful than a wild beast.”²

Conviction.

We need not be either weak-kneed or narrow-minded, we are not asked to be “ milk-and-water nothingarians ” or “ jelly-fish Churchmen.” We must beware of the dictum that “ we are all aiming at the same place.” This is true, and it is a fact ; but in spite of it, or rather because of it, it behoves each one to choose what each feels to be the best and safest route. If each one follows that faithfully and perseveringly, each will arrive at the place he desires and longs for. But if, after choosing one route, we amuse ourselves by going a mile or two by an unknown way, or by trying some bypath as an experiment, we may get lost. We Anglicans have chosen the road marked out for us, and we prefer the guide-posts set up by our Church. We shall presently explain why we do not follow the road chosen by the Dissenters.

¹ Father Brock, “ Search the Scriptures,” pp. 214, 336, 339, 390.

² Father Alexius Lepicier, O.S.M., “ De stabilitate et progressu dogmatis.” 1910. Chap. 6, Para. 9.

Why not Roman Catholics.

We now proceed to show why we do not accept the one chosen by the Roman Catholics. We have already said that we accept the term "Protestant" as used in the Coronation Service. We protest against the teaching of the Roman Catholics in the following particulars:—

(1) The Pope as Monarch of the Church.

The Romanists claim that the Pope is absolute monarch of the Church: "The Bishop of Rome is the successor of S. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles and the Vicar of Jesus Christ."¹ One writer says: "The Sovereign Pontiff is a third visible presence of Jesus amongst us"; and again, "All that is kingly, all that is priestly in our dearest Lord is gathered up in the person of His Vicar to receive our homage and our Veneration."² Another Romanist declares that "The temporal dominion of the Papacy. . . began in Jerusalem, and almost without perceiving it S. Peter found himself on a throne."³ A Pope says: "We declare, pronounce, and define that it is altogether necessary to salvation that every human creature be subject to the Roman Pontiff."⁴ We protest against this assumption of despotic power. This is one clear issue between Romanism and Angli-

¹ Creed of Pope Pius IV., 1564, Article 12.

² F. W. Faber, "Devotion to the Pope."

³ F. Dent, "Temporal Dominion of the Pope in the Divine Plan."

⁴ Boniface VIII., in Bull "Unam sanctam."

canism. We stand for the federal idea ; the absorption of all authority by one person is individualism of the worst form. The Church of England repudiates this claim of the Pope, who " hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England." ¹

How came the Pope or Bishop of Rome to make so great a claim? It has developed to such an extent that we are now told that the temporal dominion of the Papacy provides the world with a Universal Bishop and an infallible autocrat. The Bishopric of Rome is the one Apostolic See in the west, and few would grudge to the Primatial See of Christendom its primatial dignity, and it has been said that should there ever be a truly Œcumenical Council we are not concerned to repudiate the claim of the Pope to act as its natural President.² We cannot go further than that. It has been argued that Gregory, Bishop of Rome, by sending Augustine to England, obtained the right of jurisdiction, but there is much to be said in reply to such an argument. In the first place, Augustine was not wholly responsible for the conversion of England. Far more responsible were the missionaries of the Scoto-Irish Church, which was in no sense Roman ; and in the second place, even if it were true that a missionary Church obtains jurisdictional rights over its converts, then it would be Jerusalem and not Rome that is the mistress of all the Churches. But, apart

¹ Article 37.

² Dr. J. N. Figgis, " Our Debt to Rome." *Guardian*, March 4, 1915.

from argument, Gregory knew nothing of such a gigantic claim to universal authority, for, writing to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, he says: "This name 'universal' was offered during the Council of Chalcedon to the Pontiff of the Apostolic See. But no one of my predecessors ever consented to use so profane a title, plainly because if a single patriarch be called 'universal,' the name of patriarch is taken from the rest"; and to the Patriarch of Antioch he said: "If one Bishop be called 'universal,' the whole Church falls if he fall"; and he wrote in these words to the Emperor Maurice: "I confidently affirm that whoso calls himself or desires to be called 'Universal Priest,' in his pride goes before Antichrist."

The word *Pope*, from Latin *papa*, means Father, and was generally applied to all the clergy, as it is so employed to-day in the Greek Church. Strangely enough, it was John Bishop of Constantinople that first made claim to the title of "Universal Bishop," and to him Gregory, in A.D. 588, indignantly wrote: "Let your holiness in your letters never call anyone universal." How is the development of the Roman claim to be explained? Rome was once the capital of the world, and thus a certain honour attached to it, for it was called upon to make important decisions. When the Pope was consulted on ecclesiastical matters, his importance increased, and with this his claims grew more and more extravagant, but the Church of Rome, though the most powerful, was not the oldest. Jerusalem was

the first organized Church, then Samaria, and the first Gentile Church was at Antioch, and Rome actually received the Gospel from Jerusalem and Antioch. Naturally these Churches, still existent, repudiate the Roman claims. The prestige of Rome in the ancient world was immense, and its majesty impressed itself upon the barbarians of East and North. "The Roman Church was heir by default of the Cæsars," but the position of the Pope was really of human origin and arrangement, because Rome "was the Imperial City";¹ but the precedence was entirely honorary, and rested solely on State legislation. There is evidence of the Church point of view, for the Pope was expressly debarred from any interference in the following Canon:—"No Bishop shall interfere in other provinces which have not been from the very first under himself and his predecessors. But if anyone have taken a province, or caused it to be subject to him through compulsion, he must restore it."² The claim of universal jurisdiction was unheard of till the twelfth century, and Dr. Pusey quotes the saying of Bossuet "that very late condition that Bishops receive their jurisdiction from the Pope ought to be banished from Christian schools as unheard of for twelve centuries."

The Petrine succession was really an after-thought. The Church was rich in material advantages; it was pre-eminent in good works; it had gained a

¹ Council of Chalcedon, twenty-eighth Canon, A.D. 451.

² Eighth Canon of the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431.

position of far-reaching importance, and it was necessary to consolidate it by successive stages: first legend, then tradition, and from tradition to dogma was an easy step. Is not the theory of the Bishop of Rome's authority over the Church based principally upon the forged decretals of the ninth century? ¹ We can well understand how such a claim is the crux of the whole difficulty between Anglicans and Roman Catholics. All other doctrines of Purgatory, Indulgences, Transubstantiation, and the like would be accepted as a matter of course if once this full plenitude of the power of the Pope be accepted.

What proofs on behalf of this stupendous claim does the Roman Church adduce? It was necessary to find a foundation, and so it was said that S. Peter was the chief Apostle, and handed down his position to his successive Bishops of Rome. Now, it is by no means certain that S. Peter was ever at Rome, still less that he was Bishop there. The Roman Catholics say he was Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years, but if this be true it is strange that S. Paul, writing to the Romans during this period, never once mentioned S. Peter's name or sent to him any salutation. S. Paul lived there for two years "in his own hired house," and wrote the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon, and never once therein refers to S. Peter as Bishop. As Professor Collins points out, "It is striking that

¹ See F. W. Puller, "The Relation of the English Church to the Monarchical Claims of the Roman See." Longmans.

the Church which has given to the world a Bishop who claims to be as it were a Bishop of Bishops is the very Church where the Bishop at first stands out less clearly than anywhere else. In Rome the Church is plainly of great importance from the first; its clerical body, a kind of College of Presbyters or Bishops or whatever you like to call them, is of great importance, and no doubt they had from the first a chairman, but he does not stand out among them at all . . . here at Rome the separation (of bishop or presbyter) is only just taking place." ¹

Their Appeal to Scripture.

The appeal to Scripture made by the Romanists relies on three texts:

(a) "*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church.*" ² We will begin by quoting some words from a speech which the Roman Catholic Archbishop Kenrick, of Louis, U.S.A., endeavoured to deliver at the Vatican Council in A.D. 1870. Unable to make the speech, he had it printed, and privately circulated amongst the members of the Council, and sent copies to the Professors of Theology at the several Roman Catholic Universities. ³ In it he gives a rule of Biblical interpretation. The Scriptures are not to be interpreted contrary

¹ Sermons on Critical Questions." No. 11, "Episcopacy," in which he quotes the Canons of Hippolytus coming to us from Rome in the second century.

² Matt. xvi. 17-19.

³ Published in "Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum," by Professor Friedrich of Munich. There is a copy in the Library of the Protestant Alliance.

to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. Failing unanimity, the interpretation of the majority of the Fathers must be followed. He then gives five different interpretations of the word "rock," and says that seventeen Fathers declare the meaning that "the Church was built on Peter," eight understood that "it was built on all the Apostles, whom Peter represented by virtue of his primacy," forty-four Fathers and Doctors¹ assert that by the words "on this rock" are to be understood "the faith which Peter has professed"; sixteen Fathers and Doctors understood the word to mean "the rock Peter had confessed, that is, Christ"; and the fifth interpretation understands "the faithful themselves, who believe Christ to be the Son of God."

But apart altogether from the interpretations of the Fathers, which, as we have seen, are by no means unanimous, it is dangerous to rely on one or two isolated texts, because it is so easy to find others which apparently contradict them. For instance, we read that the Ephesians were "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets,"² and in the Book of the Revelation we are told, "The wall of the city had *twelve* foundations, and on them the names of the twelve Apostles."³ The authority of S. Peter over the rest seems extremely unlikely, in the light of the evidence of the New Testament, for S. Paul "withstood him to the face because he

¹ Among them are Hilary, Augustine, Leo, and Gregory the Great.

² Eph. ii. 20.

³ Rev. xxi. 14.

was to be blamed." ¹ It was S. James, and not S. Peter, that voiced the Church's decision on circumcision: "My sentence is." ² S. Paul felt able to declare that he was "not a whit behind the very chiefest Apostles," ³ and it was upon him "came daily the care of all the Churches." ⁴ It is noticeable also that this text, on which the Romanists lay such stress, is not emphasized by the other Evangelists, who make no mention of the alleged commission to S. Peter. S. Mark and S. Luke omit all reference to the words "Thou art Peter," ⁵ and we may infer that, in their minds at any rate, the most important part of the conversation was the declaration of Christ's person and office, and not the scope of S. Peter's privilege. It is strange that if the Apostles understood the high privilege S. Peter was to enjoy, they should have quarrelled as to which of them should be the greatest; and it was a little child, and not S. Peter, who was set in the midst of them. ⁶ Our Saviour evidently placed all the Apostles upon the same level when He says: "Ye which have followed Me . . . shall sit upon twelve thrones"; ⁷ and when He tells them, "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister, and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." ⁸ When the mother of Zebedee's children asked for the seat on the right and left hand in the Kingdom we do not read that

¹ Gal. ii. 11. ² Acts xv. 19. ³ 2 Cor. xi. 5.

⁴ Ibid. xi. 28. ⁵ See Mark viii, 27-33, and Luke ix. 18-23.

⁶ Matt. xviii. 1-4; xxiii. 11, 12; Mark ix. 34; Luke ix. 46.

⁷ Matt. xix. 27, 28. ⁸ Matt. xx. 20-28.

Jesus said He had already given the place on His right hand to S. Peter, but He explicitly states that the Apostles shall not, as the Princes of the Gentiles, exercise lordship. He conferred the same power of "binding and loosing" on the other Apostles,¹ and upon all of them collectively, after His Resurrection.² It will be granted that on that occasion S. Peter was leader and spokesman; it was his boat that Christ entered, and it was to him that He appealed when the tribute money was demanded; but this does not suggest or give supreme authority over the Church. We have even heard it maintained that Christ "appeared to Cephas"³ because he was Pope, but the Bible suggests it was because he had fallen. It has been argued, too, that "all the multitude kept silence"⁴ "because S. Peter had given his decision, and there was nothing more to be said"; but there was something more to be said, and S. Paul and S. Barnabas said it.

(b) *"I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."*⁵ Far from denoting dignity, this text seems to emphasize inferiority. S. Peter was specially prayed for because he had been tempted in a way that the others were not. But, in any case, it cannot be maintained that it was to be S. Peter's special prerogative to strengthen the brethren, for this was enjoined upon every one of the disciples, as indeed it is enjoined upon each of us. The word here

¹ Matt. xviii. 18.

² John xx. 21-23.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 5.

⁴ Acts xv. 12.

⁵ Luke xxii. 32.

translated "strengthen" ¹ is used repeatedly in the New Testament; and perhaps the most interesting instance is its use by S. Paul, who, writing to Rome, S. Peter's alleged see, says: "I hope to see you that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be strengthened." ²

(c) "*Feed My sheep*," ³ but this duty was laid upon all the Apostles. The same commission is given by S. Paul to the Elders at Ephesus: "feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood," ⁴ and by S. Peter himself. ⁵ It is also worth noting that when the latter, after receiving his commission, exhibited some curiosity, and asked the Master concerning S. John, "What shall this man do?" he received a rebuke by way of reply, "What is that to thee?" It would seem as though the threefold commission "feed my sheep" is a symbol of inferiority rather than of superiority, for it must have reminded S. Peter of his threefold denial. If it be argued that he takes the lead in the first twelve chapters of the Acts, it may equally well be contended that S. Paul takes it in the subsequent chapters, and it is also noteworthy that it was the Apostles who sent S. Peter and S. John to hold a confirmation at Samaria. This does not argue for S. Peter's supremacy. S. Paul does not seem to recognize it, but he does assert that God has "set the apostles first in the Church."

¹ στήριξεν.

⁴ Acts xx. 28.

² Rom. i. 11.

⁵ 1 Peter v. 2.

³ John xxi. 16.

(2) *The Infallibility of the Pope.*

The Roman Church claims that the Pope, when speaking *ex cathedra* (i.e. from the chair or officially) on matters of faith and morals, cannot make a mistake. He is infallible. Two brief comments may be made by way of preface. It was only at the Vatican Council so lately as 1870 that this doctrine of infallibility was declared; thus it is very modern. Do you, can you really, believe there is any man who cannot make a mistake in an official opinion upon matters of faith or morals? The Romanists are very careful to restrict this doctrine within such narrow limits, and it is not applied, therefore, to secular subjects unconnected with faith or morals. The Pope is not infallible, for instance, in mathematics or physics, and not even on faith and morals except when speaking officially. It is doubtful whether a single official pronouncement has been made by any Pope since 1870 which can be said to bind the Holy See beyond the power of reviewing its decision. Infallibility does not attach to a Pope's published writings, and official teaching is infallible only when it is given *ex cathedra*. According to the Vatican definition, the Pope is only said to teach "from the chair," "when, discharging his office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, in virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine concerning faith and morals as to be held by the whole Church." Thus he must be addressing the entire Church, not

some individual, or some portion of the Church.¹ Armed with such restrictions, it is comparatively easy to get out of an unpleasant incident in history. Take as an example the well-known case of Galileo, who was compelled by the Inquisition to assert that the sun goes round the earth. Observe the course of reasoning. The order was imposed upon an individual, not on an entire Church. The Cardinals imposed it, not the Pope, and if it be asserted that the decision was sanctioned by the Pope, he did not give his name to the written document, nor was he acting as the teacher of all Christians by virtue of his supreme authority. It is very plausible and clever. When the Roman controversialist is reminded that S. Paul rebuked S. Peter, it is easy to say that 'S. Peter was not addressing the whole Church, and was not teaching. It was his conduct that was blamed, and blamed, forsooth, "because it was inconsistent with his own undoubted teaching!"'² The doctrine of infallibility is very modern, but the Roman controversialist tells us "the doctrine is ancient, though its formal definition by an Œcumenical Council is recent," and "there is no inconsistency between these two statements."³ He argues that "definitions presuppose a controversy, and it is their purpose to end it"; but why was there any controversy concerning the doctrine? The Romanists say there was none earlier than the

¹ See Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J., "Papal Supremacy and Infallibility," Catholic Truth Society.

² Ibid. p. 19.,

³ Ibid. p. 25.

fourteenth century. Might not that be because the doctrine was never set forth? If S. Peter's faith was rewarded by making him the Church's rock, and by perpetuating his faith in the infallible teaching of the Bishops of Rome, what was the reward of his denial of his Master? Is that perpetuated also? We should all be thankful to believe there was any human being on earth infallible, even within the narrow limits now defined by the Roman Church, but we cannot, with our intellect, accept this doctrine.

(3) *Transubstantiation.*

The Romanists teach that after consecration the bread and wine become the actual Body and Blood of Christ. If you were to attend Holy Communion or Mass in a Roman Church you would receive the bread, but not the wine. The chalice is not given to the laity, because the Bread or Body is said to contain the Blood, and it is unnecessary to give Christ twice over to the communicant.

Transubstantiation was only declared an article of faith in 1215 by Pope Innocent III., and the chalice was not withheld till A.D. 1415. The Church of England declares that "the Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people, for both parts of the sacrament ought to be ministered."¹ It is the recorded opinion of Pope Gelasius that to communicate in one kind is a great sacrilege.

¹ Article 30.

"We hear that certain persons receive a portion of the sacred Body alone, and abstain from the cup of the sacred Blood. Let such persons, by all means, since they are said to be bound by the ties of some superstition, either receive or be repelled from the entire sacrament; because the division of one and the same mystery cannot take place without great sacrilege." ¹

In attempting to define a great mystery—and the Real Presence of Christ in this sacrament is a mystery—the Romanists have overstepped the mark, and over-defined the explanation, when it is said: (i.) If anyone shall deny that, in the sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist, there are contained truly, really, and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore the whole Christ, and shall say that He is only in it by sign, or figure, or virtually, let him be accursed; and (ii.) If anyone shall say that, in the sacrament, there remain the Bread and Wine along with the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny the wonderful conversion of the whole substance of the Bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the Wine into the Blood, which conversion the Catholic Church most appropriately calls Transubstantiation, let him be accursed.² By these statements they have marked a sharp dividing line between themselves and us, for we believe that "Transubstantiation

¹ Wordsworth's "Letters to Gondon," sequel, p. 128.

² Council of Trent, sixteenth century.

cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.”¹ Although the Council of Trent declared that communicants in one kind were deprived of no grace necessary to salvation, yet Pope Clement VI. granted the chalice to a King of France, “to the greater increase of grace.”² Cardinal Bona, who died in 1674, says: “It is certain that all clergy and laity, men and women, received the Communion anciently in both kinds, when they were present at its public administration. . . . At all times, and in all places, from the infancy of the Church to the twelfth century, the faithful communicated in the kind both of bread and wine.”³ Canon Liddon was once asked the difference between the doctrine of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, and replied, “The first is a fact, and the second is an attempted explanation.” To many the readiness of the Roman Church to give a cut-and-dried answer to a question is a characteristic they wish the Church of England possessed; but are we quite sure that these clear-cut definitions have value? Was it the method of Christ? He seldom gives a plain answer. It is more often an indirect reply, by means of a parable, or another question, or a principle, and He seeks to call forth the reasoning powers of His hearers, as for example in His question, “Whom say ye that I am?”

¹ Article 28.

² See “Dr. Pusey’s Letter to the Bishop of London.”

³ “Wordsworth’s Letters,” p. 139.

How much wiser than official definitions are the words of S. Cyril of Jerusalem: "Be fully persuaded that the seeming bread is not bread, though sensible to the touch, but the Body of Christ, and the seeming wine is not wine, though the taste would have it so, but the Blood of Christ." Let it suffice for us "that we are made partakers of His very Self. How the blessing is bestowed, we are unable to explain. . . . We can do better than explain; we can accept the fact, and look to prove it in experience." The teaching of the Church of England is well summarized for us in these words: "A living truth, a mystery of fire and cloud, sufficiently expressed to secure reverence to the heavenly gift, but with no encumbrance of authorized metaphysic."¹ When Archbishop Laud was on his trial for invoking the Holy Spirit, because invoking Him to consecrate was to suppose that the change in the elements is a work of God's omnipotence, he replied: "A work of omnipotence it is, whatever the change be. For less than omnipotence cannot change those elements, either in nature or use, to so high a service as they are put in that great sacrament."²

A "Eucharistic declaration," signed by High Church clergy, and presented in 1867 to Archbishop Longley, repudiated (1) A Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood, and the conception of the mode of His Presence which implies the

¹ Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Talbot).

² Works, III., p. 335.

physical change of the natural substances of the bread and wine, but a belief that the Body and Blood, the inward part or thing signified, are present really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, (2) the notion of any fresh sacrifice, but believing that as in heaven Christ ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father, pleading His Sacrifice of Himself, so on earth, in the Holy Eucharist, that same Body and Blood, sacramentally present, are pleaded before the Father by the priest, and (3) all adoration of the sacramental bread and wine, which would be idolatry. With reference to the use of a ritual beyond what had become common, the declaration further stated there was no desire "to introduce a system of worship foreign to the Church of England," but "having at heart the promotion of the glory of God in the due and reverent celebration of the Holy Eucharist as the central act of Divine Worship."

The doctrine of Transubstantiation is contrary to the evidence of our sense of sight, smell, taste, and touch, but the Roman priest will say: "You do not understand; those are 'the accidents' of the Mass, but the 'essence' is the Body and Blood of Christ." If Anglican writers are accused of a misty indefiniteness, Roman Catholics are so eager to explain where explanations must fail, and to define where definition is inadequate, that they are enmeshed in the trammels of over-technicality.

In the words of the Council of Constance, "This present Council declares, decrees, and defines that although Christ instituted this venerable Sacrament

after Supper, and administered it to His Disciples under both species of Bread and Wine, yet it is notwithstanding. . . ." These last words seem to alter the very purpose and practice of Christ.

One would fain not discuss and argue about so delicate and difficult a subject, but this doctrine of Transubstantiation seems to force the belief that our Saviour took His Own Body in His Own Hands, and gave the whole of that Body to each of the Disciples. That very same Body, now in Heaven, is at the same time in many thousands of places on the earth; it is a perfect Body, yet contained in the space of an inch; it is upon the Altar, and in the streets, and meets itself when carried in procession, and this Body can be lost or stolen or burned or become mouldy. This is all against reason, and to us is unthinkable. If some of our own Theologians are at pains to declare that the words "This is My Body" only mean "This represents My Body," they do not therefore derogate the reverence to be paid to the Sacrament. I can reverence what represents quite as much as the actual Body, and I accept the teaching of the Catechism that "The Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." In the words attributed to Queen Elizabeth,

"His was the word that spake it,
He took the bread and brake it;
And what that Word did make it
I do believe and take it."

(4) The Worship of the Virgin Mary.

There have been additions to and subtractions from the ancient teaching about the Virgin Mother. She has been accorded powers she does not possess, and she has been robbed of dignity which is hers by right.

Such a statement as "Mary has only to speak, and her Son executes all,"¹ is repugnant to us. We do not accept the teaching that she is "the refuge of sinners" or "the window of heaven," nor do we believe she was taken up bodily into heaven, nor that she is "the dispensatrix of God's grace." We refuse to acknowledge that "Mary is the star which conducts and guides us to the harbour of salvation," or that we need her intervention to obtain salvation because "God wishes us to receive all graces through the prayers of Mary."

The eminent ecclesiastic, whose position and piety demand respect, has declared that "there is no safer, no more speedy way to join all men to Christ than through Mary, and through her to attain the perfect adoption of the sons of God"; and again, "Since the Son of God, made man, is the Author and Perfecter of our faith, it is therefore necessary to acknowledge His mother as the sharer and, as it were, guardian of the Divine Mysteries"; and again, "Since it has pleased God's Eternal Providence to give us our Divine Saviour through Mary, there is nothing left for us but to receive Christ from Mary's hands."

¹ Liguori's "Glories of Mary."

"The times are bad," declares this Pope, "nevertheless the most Blessed Virgin shines in the deluge of evil like a rainbow, to make peace between God and man. Although the storm may rage and the sky be dark as night, let no one doubt. God will be reconciled by the sight of Mary, and will spare us"; and once more, "Prayers founded on the love of God, and strengthened by Mary's intercession, are never said in vain."¹ Chrysostom, a saint in the Roman Calendar, commenting upon the words of the Virgin Mother at Cana, says: "His mother was guilty of superfluous vanity, as she wanted to show the people that she had power and authority over Him." We remember Christ's rebuke, "What is there between me and thee?" She was human, He divine. The Bible says, "Hail, thou that art highly favoured, blessed art thou among women." We believe this, but we do not accept the Romanist worship of her.² We cannot treat her with indignity, or deny the teaching of the Magnificat, and we think they are wrong who fear to call her "Blessed." We give her the place and dignity assigned to her by our Prayer Book, wherein the five festivals in her honour keep her before the eyes of the faithful, and wherein the Athanasian Hymn proclaims her glory, but not her divinity.

¹ "Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius X." Catholic Truth Society.

² In the Parochial Hymn Book, in use among English Roman Catholics, out of 280 hymns, 68 are in honour of the Virgin, 12 of S. Joseph, and only 8 of the Holy Spirit!

(5) *The Immaculate Conception of the Virgin.*

This means the Romanists believe that the Virgin, unlike other human beings, was not "conceived in sin"; in other words, that she was free from the taint of original sin, which belongs to all other human beings. This doctrine, like so many others of the Roman Church, was declared in recent times. It was promulgated in the decree of Pope Pius IX. in 1854. We find no Scriptural foundation for it. Previous to 1854 it had been a pious opinion held by many in the Roman Church. The Romanists will doubtless argue that the definition presupposed controversy, and was declared to silence it. In the twelfth century St. Bernard rebuked some canons at Lyons for setting apart a day in honour of the Immaculate Conception. The controversy had been fierce and prolonged, till at length a pious opinion was declared an article of faith, necessary to salvation.

There are some who in these days are ready to deny that man has fallen, by original sin, from his high estate. The Roman Church thus finds herself in the company of those she would least expect able to accept her doctrines of the "Immaculate Conception."

We would, at any rate, prefer to believe in the Immaculate Conception of one rather than of all, but we cannot accept the doctrine as applicable to anyone. Once again the Roman Church lays claim to be an infallible guide through the Pope. The

controversialist argues that "when a doctrine is defined to be an article of faith, it is not meant that the Church makes that to be true to-day which was untrue yesterday." All doctrines are in the Apostolic tradition, and when its meaning is not clear, and men err in their interpretation, "the Church alone is infallible. . . . and there would be many serious inconveniences, if the Church allowed matters to go on any longer, without pronouncing a solemn judgment." When S. Bernard spoke against the "Immaculate Conception" it is true that he ended by saying: "I reserve this and all else to the authority and examination of the Roman Church, and am ready to amend my opinion by her judgment, if in anything I should be found not to be of one mind with her";¹ but he would have waited some centuries before he need have amended his opinions! What a pity some Pope did not declare the doctrine an article of faith long ago, for thus he might have saved endless controversy. If Sixtus IV., Pius V., or Paul V. had done so, they need not have forbidden the advocates for and against the opinion to call each other heretical. If a decision presupposes a controversy, then indeed the decision on this matter is much overdue. Passages are quoted in order to express the spirit of the history of this doctrine. One such is from Suarez (sixteenth century),² in which this theologian says: "It is not wonderful that the ancient Fathers

¹ Ep. 174.

² "De mysteris," Disp. iii., quoted in "The Immaculate Conception" (Catholic Truth Society), p. 28.

should say but little of this privilege of the Virgin, partly because the Holy Spirit teaches the Church by degrees, and partly also because the Fathers were occupied in defending mysteries which more urgently needed explanation. For the last five hundred years it has begun to be more clearly taught, and the faith is so generally increased that it is now received with almost universal consent." Exactly! The Pope might then safely proceed to declare it an article of faith. It reminds one of the belated action on the part of the present Pope before he would declare an opinion on the German treatment of Belgium and of Lille. If the importance of an urgently needed explanation may be measured by the rejoicing that accompanied it, then indeed no explanation was more urgently needed, for Pope Pius X. in his encyclical says: "There is no one who does not know with what gladness, with what signs of rejoicing, the Faithful all over the world received that proclamation." It is a pity, we repeat, that it was not uttered earlier, especially as this same Pope states that his belief in the Immaculate Conception has seemed in every age so comformable to the Christian sense, that it has always been natural and obvious to the mind of the Faithful.¹ Why delay to proclaim the obvious? The definition was published in the Basilica of S. Peter on December 8, 1854, and was as follows: "By the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of

¹ "De mysteris," Disp. iii., quoted in "The Immaculate Conception" (Catholic Truth Society), p. 12.

the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own authority, we declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which holds that the most Blessed Virgin Mary in the first instant of her Conception was, by the singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, and in consideration of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the human race, preserved free from all stain of original sin, is a doctrine revealed by God, and therefore most firmly and constantly to be believed by all the Faithful. Wherefore if any, which God avert, shall presume to think in their hearts differently from what has been defined by us, let them know . . . that they are liable *ipso facto* to all the lawful penalties, if they shall dare to express what they thus feel in their hearts, either by word, writing, or any external sign."

The Bible makes no exception, for "all have sinned," ¹ and "death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," ² and "Scripture hath concluded all under sin," ³ and the Virgin herself admits she is a sinner when she exclaims "My Spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." ⁴

It will be noticed also that the Virgin is never mentioned in the Epistles, and the Romanists make no appeal to the Scriptures in support of their doctrine. Apart from this, how can she hear the prayers addressed to her from all parts, unless she be omniscient and omnipresent, which she is not, for these are attributes of God alone?

¹ Romans iii. 23. ² Romans v. 12. ³ Gal. iii. 22. ⁴ Luke i. 47.

(6) *Purgatory.*

The Council of Trent teaches there is a place of Purgatory, where the souls of the justified endure suffering before they go to heaven. We state our belief that this Romish doctrine of Purgatory "is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."¹ The word "Romish" should be emphasized, for the Article does not condemn the word "Purgatory," and indeed the Prayer Book uses the verb "to purge" in the Commendatory Prayer for the soul at the point of departure,² and seems to imply a place of spiritual purging in the intermediate state, in the prayer "that whatever defilements it (the soul) may have contracted through the lusts of the flesh or the wiles of Satan, being purged and done away, it may be presented pure and without spot."

It is only fair to say that all Rome teaches by formal decree is that there is a Purgatory and that the souls detained there are helped by prayer and the sacrifice of the Altar, but the general teaching goes much further than this. The horrors of Purgatory abound in Roman books. In one such it is stated that "It is an article of faith that one small venial sin committed without scruple, the least offence against truth, a small neglect in the service of God, a little raillery, a slight impatience or vanity, too much eagerness after pleasure, is enough to

¹ Article 22.² Visitation of the Sick.

condemn you for a long time to the flames of Purgatory.”¹

According to primitive teaching, the soul after death is sent to a place of happiness or misery in Hades, and there remained to the day of judgment. Roman teaching to-day abridges this intermediate state for the vast majority of souls, and abolishes it altogether for those who have died in exceptional holiness.²

Prayers for the Dead.

Excess in one direction generally means violent reaction in another. It has cast suspicion upon prayers for the dead, which were the rule in the early Church, and appear in the old Liturgies. It was because all kinds of teaching concerning departed souls arose that various sufferings were invented and imagined, and a reaction having set in, we were robbed of prayers for the dead. Yet it is surely an instinct of the heart to remember those who have passed away. A mother who has prayed for her children since they were born will not cease to pray for them when God has taken them to Himself, and a man who has prayed for his mother while she lived will not omit to “make mention of her” when she is “lost awhile.”

The favourite text of Scripture which is said to prove the inefficiency of prayers for the dead is

¹ “Man’s Only Affair.” Roman Catholic Book Society, Dublin. 1833, p. 108.

² Luckock, “The Intermediate State.”

contained in the words: "If the tree fall toward the south or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be,"¹ but there is nothing in the context here to warrant a reference to the state of the departed. As an illustration of the dead nothing could be less appropriate as the description of fixity of state, for a tree is seldom allowed to remain where it falls. It is carried away and serves some useful purpose. But it is never wise to rest evidence upon an isolated text. Prayers for the dead rest upon the whole conception of immortality. The Jews from a remote period have prayed for their dead; ² they did so in our Lord's day, they do so to-day. Prayer was offered in the Synagogues for the soul of Queen Victoria in these words: Recompense her work . . . may her soul be bound in the bond everlasting, with the soul of the husband of her youth. The request for such prayers is made in Jewish wills.³ The heathen would pray for and provide for their dead. The Christian Church from the earliest times prayed for their dead.⁴ All civilized peoples—Christian, Jew, and heathen alike—always have prayed, and do so pray to-day, for their departed, with the solitary exception of the Protestant sects which have arisen since the Reformation, who

¹ Eccles. xi. 3.

² 2 Maccabees xii. 43. Judas prays for those slain that their sin may be put wholly out of remembrance.

³ "This bequest to be given to such boy inmate as shall be appointed to say and shall say prayers for the repose of . . ." (will of Mr. Charles Samuel).

⁴ S. Paul prayed for Onesiphorus—2 Tim. i. 18.

cannot, however, base their practice upon the Reformation. The Reformers cleared away the perversions of primitive usage, but the documents and writings of the Reformation period lend no favour to the abolition of such prayers, as witness the following passage : " Forasmuch as due order of charity requireth, and the Book of Maccabees and divers ancient doctors plainly show, that it is a very good and a charitable deed to pray for souls departed ; and forasmuch also as such usage hath continued in the Church so many years, even from the beginning ; we think it convenient that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach the people committed unto their spiritual charge, that no man ought to be grieved with the continuance of the same ; and that it standeth with the very due order of charity that Christian man should pray for the souls of the departed, and commit them in our prayers to God's mercy." ¹

This is a very fair indication of the minds of the Reformers.

In the first Prayer Book occur these words : " We commend unto Thy mercy, O Lord, all other Thy servants which are departed from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace ; grant unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy and everlasting peace," and in the Burial Service, " We commend into Thy hands of mercy, most merciful Father, the soul of this our brother departed . . .

¹ " The Institutions of a Christian Man," drawn up by a Commission appointed by the King in 1537.

that when the judgment shall come, which Thou hast committed to Thy well-beloved Son, both this our brother and we may be found acceptable in Thy sight."

The testimony of individual Reformers is not less strong. Bishop Andrewes says that the Holy Communion, pleading the sacrifice of Christ, is available for present and absent, living and dead, yea, of those that are yet unborn, and he gives this prayer: "Whether we live or die, Thou art our Lord; on living and dead, have mercy, O Lord." ¹ Jeremy Taylor says: "All the Fathers did pray for the dead, yet they never prayed for their deliverance out of Purgatory, nor ever meant it." ²

Bishop Cosin, a lifelong enemy of Rome, wrote: "Prayer for the dead cannot be denied but to have been universally used of all Christians in the ancientist and purest times of the Church, and by the Greek Fathers, that never admitted any purgatory no more than we do, and yet pray for the dead notwithstanding"; and in his comment on the prayer after the committal to the grave, wrote: "The Puritans think that here is prayer for the dead and practised by the Church of England, and so think I; but we are not both of one mind in censuring the Church for so doing. They say it is Popish and superstitious; I, for my part, esteem it pious and Christian." The words of this prayer are: "That we and all those that are departed," and call forth this comment also from him: "Here

¹ Private devotions.

² "Dissuasion from Popery."

is a prayer, and a prayer for the dead . . . this prayer, therefore, relateth to them that are dead . . . as well as to ourselves that make profession of it here in this life." The words in the Holy Communion, "That we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins," may include the departed, but the context is not indisputable, yet this same Bishop interprets the words as embracing "the living and those that are present, but likewise those that are absent, and them that be already departed, or shall in time to come live and die in the faith of Christ."

It is true that our Prayer Book and formularies admit no explicit prayers for the departed into the public language of the Church, from fear of the mischievous abuses in later mediæval days, but the Church of England has nowhere declared it erroneous or illegal to believe in the efficacy of such petitions,¹ and to this many of her leaders, of varying schools of thought, bear testimony. In very beautiful words we are told that "surely now there is place for a gentler recognition of the instructive, the natural, the loyal craving of the bereaved, and the abuses of the chantry system need not now, nearly four centuries afterwards, thwart or hinder the reverent, the absolutely trustful prayer of a wounded spirit, who feels it natural and helpful to pray for him whom he shall not greet on earth again, but

¹ The Bidding Prayer, as ordered by Canon 55 (Code of 1603), contains the words, "Let us praise God for all those that are departed out of this life in the faith of Christ, and pray that we may be made partakers with them of the glorious Resurrection."

who in his Father's loving keeping still lives, and, as we may surely believe, still grows from strength to strength in truer purity, and in deepened reverence and love,"¹ and in a recent letter wrote that "the Church of England has never declared prayer for the dead is contrary to sound doctrine."

Beautiful are the words of a prelate, who will not be regarded as prejudiced in favour of prayers for the dead: "Misgivings about prayers for the dead are wholly justified, if the prayer in question means necessarily prayer for deliverance from gloom and pain, rather than a breath of loving aspiration sent after the spirit into its abode of light, asking, as a certainty may be asked for, for the perpetual growth in the emancipated being of the graces and the bliss of the heavenly rest, and its holy progress and education in the knowledge of its Lord. It is undoubted that such prayer for the departed is found in the fragmentary remains of very early Christian literature, certainly written within half a century, of the last Apostles . . . and I for one cannot condemn such exercises of the soul, where reverent thought invites to it, in the private devotions of a Christian. Before me lies a prayer composed for such private use. It is beautiful in its restraint and tenderness: Grant that his life may unfold itself in Thy sight, and find a sweet employment in the

¹ Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Davidson) at All Hallows, 1914. He sanctions the use, among others, of the following forms of service:—"A memorial service for those fallen in the war" (S.P.C.K.), "a memorial service" by the Bishop of Stepney (Mowbray), and "the memorial of such as have fallen" (S.P.C.K.).

spacious fields of Eternity . . . tell him, gracious Lord, if it may be, how much I love him . . . and long to see him again, and if there be ways in which he may come . . . grant me a sense of his presence in such a degree as Thy laws permit. Pardon, O gracious Lord and Father, whatever is amiss in this my prayer, and let Thy will be done, for my will is blind and erring, but Thine is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, through Jesus Christ our Lord." ¹

Archbishop Temple said: "To pray for the dead is not forbidden by the New Testament, and it is not forbidden by the Church of England. But while the Church of England nowhere forbids prayers for the departed, it nevertheless does not authorize the introduction of such prayers into our public worship except in the most cautious manner. In our public worship we pray for ourselves that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of God's Holy Name, may have perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul in God's eternal and everlasting glory. This is the model we are bound to follow in our public worship . . . in our private prayers there is nothing in the Church of England teaching to forbid our prayers for those whom we love, and who are gone before us." ² The same Bishop said that "a larger liberty in this matter is allowed by the Church of England to

¹ Bishop of Durham (Dr. Moule), "Christus Consolator," S.P.C.K., p. 97 seq.

² Visitation Charge, 1898.

private piety than she has thought fit to adopt for the last three and a half centuries in her public worship, a certain restraint being imposed on her practice by historical causes."

Bishop Stubbs says: "I believe it is legally recognized that to pray for the dead is not forbidden in the Church of England; the idea recommends itself very strongly to the hearts and affections of a great number of good Christian people."¹ Bishop Paget (Oxford) uses similar words: "I am thankful with all my heart that the Church of England has never forbidden the use of such prayer. It seems to me . . . both just and wise to recognize fully and openly the freedom which the Church of England thus allows. . . . Many of us may wish that the pure and beautiful and uplifting entreaties of the most ancient liturgies had a place in our own Prayer Book."² Many will welcome these words of a well known scholar, and re-echo them: "Far be it from me to say that prayer for the dead is wrong. If it were a sin, it is one which it is almost impossible not to commit, when we lose one whose name it has been our constant habit to mention in our prayers. In spite of theory, the loved name will still rise to our lips, and then are we bound to suppress our yearnings of desire, or blush that they should be known to our Father who is in heaven?"³

The Dean of Canterbury (Dr. Wace) expresses

¹ Visitation Charge, 1899.

² Visitation Charge, 1906.

³ Dr. Salmon, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin.

WHY I AM NOT A ROMAN CATHOLIC 101

the opinion that "if prayers for the dead were confined within the limits in which they are in the ancient Liturgies, as for example more particularly the Clementine Liturgy, they certainly could not be resisted on the principle which I am now advocating" (an appeal to the first six centuries), and he should welcome their re-introduction, because he thought it was "a very beautiful and gracious custom."¹

Dr. Benson (Archbishop of Canterbury) used this petition for his son: "Yea, Lord, and give rest to my Martin in a place of light, where he may behold the light of Thy countenance."² He also used the following paraphrase from the Sarum Missal in his private devotions when celebrating the Holy Communion: "Remember also N., thy servant. . . . To him, O Lord, with all that rest in Christ give place of refreshment, light, and peace, where the brightness of Thy countenance is lifted upon them, and sorrow and sighing are fled away."³ He also gives a series of prayers for the faithful departed.⁴

In a letter written to a friend Dr. Neale says: "Every known liturgy in the Christian world, Catholic or heretical, prayed for the dead up to the time of Calvin. On the whole, there is far more evidence from the teaching of the Church for the utility of prayers for the dead than there is for the

¹ I have made free use of two articles in the *Guardian*, November, 1914, by Rev. P. H. Ditchfield, F.S.A.

² "Prayers Public and Private," p. 169, Ishister & Co.

³ *Ibid.* p. 174. ⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 227-8.

doctrine of the Trinity. The latter, as we know, was very early denied, the former never. Now just see how, both in Protestantism and modern Romanism, it is the same rationalizing spirit. The Protestant says: 'I cannot see what especial good I shall do my departed friends by praying for them; therefore I will not pray for them at all.' The Roman Catholic says: 'Neither do I'; and therefore he invests Purgatory with all those horrors, and has something to pray about. Only just compare both practices with those beautiful prayers of the Church in the first seven or eight centuries, which only ask increase of holiness, of rest, of nearness to God, of being led forth in the green pastures, and fed beside the still water. I should like to know on what principle a Protestant refuses to pray for his friends in Paradise, but will pray for one in India, of whose present needs he knows pretty nearly as little, and who, for aught he can say, may not be in this world at all S. Paul tells his converts to make supplication 'for me and for all saints.' Are those in Paradise not Saints?''¹

Thackeray, "that representative of the untheological public," makes Amelia teach her little son to pray daily for his father fallen on the field of battle.²

¹ Dated October 8, 1864.

² "Vanity Fair," Chap. 38: "The mother and the little boy prayed to our Father together, the child lisping after her as she spoke, and each time they prayed to God to bless dear papa, as if he were alive, and in the room with them."

There are some who value the decisions of the Courts. The Court of Arches in 1838 thus dealt with the matter "Is praying for the dead involved in the doctrine of Purgatory. . . . Prayer for the dead is a practice of much earlier date than the introduction of the doctrine of Purgatory. . . . The authorities seem to go no further than this, to show that the Church discouraged prayers for the dead, but did not prohibit them, and that the twenty-second Article is not violated by the use of such prayers. I am then of opinion that no authority or Canon has been pointed out by which the practice of praying for the departed has been expressly prohibited." The Archbishop of Melbourne (Dr. Lowther-Clarke) points out that when this article was being drawn up a sentence was introduced condemning prayers for the dead, and this was deliberately struck out before the article was authorized.¹ It is evident, then, that the testimony in favour of prayers for the dead is strong, and emanates from many and varied quarters.

On one occasion our Saviour lifted the veil and showed us two departed souls. The soul of the rich man was not asleep, it was a living personality. It was not unconscious. Memory, remorse, reflection were there. May we not pray, then, that God will vouchsafe to the souls of those we have known love, light, refreshment, and peace. May we not ask God abundantly to bless a father, a mother, a brother, a sister, or a

¹ "English Church Review," 1916, p. 198.

friend? A man's own heart tells him he need seek no proof of the rightness of a pious and Christian custom.

(7) *Indulgences.*

With the fires of Purgatory is bound up the traffic in indulgences. Romanists teach that Christ gave to His Church the power of bestowing indulgences. At first in the Roman Church they were for the benefit only of the living; it was later that they were made applicable to the souls in Purgatory. In a catalogue recently issued by a firm of Roman Catholic publishers there were particulars of "the pardon crucifix," the symbol of the "pious union," and it was described as "a new and richly indulgenced devotion for the reconciliation of friends, relatives, etc." The faithful are exhorted to buy this particular firm's crucifixes because, as is naïvely suggested, "neither the French nor the American models benefit the Foreign Missions." In the opinion of Dr. Pusey the sale of indulgences "very chiefly caused the Reformation." We readily believe it. An indulgence is remission by the Church of temporal punishment for sins. There are plenary and partial indulgences. Pope Innocent III. reserved the right of granting plenary indulgences, and Bishops were allowed only to grant partial ones. This became, in time, a source of abuse, and Popes outbade each other in the indulgences offered. Pope Pius VI. went so far as

to say that an indulgence might remit the temporal punishment which awaited a penitent *after* death in Purgatory.¹ This was surely to usurp the prerogatives of God !

(8) *The Sacrifice of Masses.*

The Council of Trent declared : " In this Divine Sacrifice the same Christ is contained and offered as was offered upon the Cross. This sacrifice is really propitiatory ; by it God is surely appeased, bestows grace, and forgives all crimes and sins, how great so ever. Wherefore, it is properly offered, not only for the sins, punishments, and other necessities of living believers, but also for the dead in Christ who are not yet thoroughly purified." ²

The Word "Mass."

The word " mass " is really quite harmless. It has no doctrinal significance whatever. Its derivation is doubtful, and it is interesting to consider various alternatives. Assuming that " mass " is derived from " missa," from the phrase " go, it is a dismissal," ³ it means " the people are dismissed, the Divine Service is concluded." This is not, however,

¹ Bull, " *Auctorem Fidei*," 1794. Consult also Lea's " *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*," 1896.

² Twenty-fifth Session.

³ *Ite missa est.* Writing to Gundobad, Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, explains by request that *Missam facere* (to make a dismissal) is equivalent to *dimittere* (to dismiss).

inappropriate, for in the early Church there were dismissals of catechumens or candidates for baptism, for penitents and the like, each with the Bishop's blessing, so that the word came to mean "a dismissal with the Divine Blessing," and might well be used for Holy Communion Service, from which people were dismissed with God's blessing in Christ resting upon them. It has been urged by some that the word "mass" is a corruption of "mensa" or "messa," the equivalent of the English "mess," and means a table, Domini being understood. It then becomes "the table of the Lord," which is scriptural and philologically correct. There is a similar and possible derivation from the second syllable of Kermess or Kirchmesse, an annual parish festival in the Low Countries, parts of Germany and elsewhere, commemorating the dedication of a church. If this be correct, it is a modification of an old Teutonic word, meaning "feast."¹ A further suggestion is that "missa" is derived from "mittere" (to place),² and would thus mean "what is placed upon the table," *i.e.* food, hence a common meal, and applied to the Lord's Supper.³ The word was applied in the fourth century to the services of the canonical hours, as Silvia testifies in her account of the services at Jerusalem.⁴ Cassian refers to a similar use of the term, and calls

¹ Crabb Robinson's Diary, Vol. III., p. 22. See also "Archæologia," Vol. 26, p. 242.

² Compare the French "mettre."

³ The old French "mes," modern "mets," a dish, or anything offered to eat, is traced by etymologists to "missum."

⁴ Peregr. Silvæ I., Daily Offices I., Matins.

Holy Communion the oblation or sacrifice.¹ "Missa" became the technical term for the mass in the sixth and seventh centuries.² There are some who urge that we ought not to make a present of the word "mass" as well as "catholic" to the Romanists, yet "few things have done more mischief than the needless use of this word, partly from a modern tendency, but more from a desire to obliterate old distinctions, and to restore unity by agreement in words, when there was no corresponding unity in the thing signified."³

It should be remembered that "mass" is not an essential name for Holy Communion, which has always and everywhere been so used. It does not involve the idea of sacrifice. It is not used in the Eastern Church, which employs the technical word "liturgy." "The word mass arose in the west."⁴ It seems utterly unnecessary to use a term that perplexes and annoys large numbers of loyal Churchmen, and the only purpose of its use is to emphasize a doctrinal significance that is really alien from it. Unlike such terms as "Eucharist," "Communion," "Lord's Supper," which are scriptural, "mass" is not only unscriptural, but meaningless. It is comparatively modern, and is not used by ancient ecclesiastical writers. Bishop Creighton and Bishop Stubbs have expressed an opinion concerning its

¹ "De Cœnobiorum Institutis," 2, 7, 13, and 15; 3, 7; 11, 15.

² I have made free use of a leading article in the *Guardian*, September 6, 1917, and of the ensuing correspondence.

³ Creighton: "Life and Letters," II., 426.

⁴ Dr. Fortescue, a well-known Roman Catholic Liturgist, "The Mass," p. 401.

use which should carry weight. The former says : " When a word is associated with a long-standing controversy, it is a great mistake to attempt to revive it. . . . Few things have done more mischief than the needless use of the word ' mass.' " ¹ The latter " would beg the clergy to abstain from using the word ' mass ' for the service of celebrating the Holy Sacrament. The word ' mass ' signifies that form of celebration which is proper to the Roman and unreformed Church of the west. . . . the word means not the sacrament, but the service of celebration . . . the service of our own Church . . . in form and ritual is not the same as the Roman . . . to use the name that belongs to one particular form or rite for another form, which is distinct from it, is not only inconsistent, but incompatible with truth." ² Dr. Pusey quotes with approval, in a letter written in 1875, a saying of Dr. Liddon's that the use of the word alienated thousands who ought to belong to us. The late Rev. W. Allen Whitworth, Vicar of All Saints, Margaret Street, dealing with various terms applied to Holy Communion, says : " Since 1549 the name ' mass ' has been discarded, and wisely, for . . . it has become associated with an aspect of the sacrament in which the action of the priest is everything, and the communion of the people of little account." ³ The Romanists teach that Christ is offered at each

¹ Creighton, " Church and Nation," p. 307.

² " Fourth Visitation Charge." Univ. Press, Oxford, 1899, p. 32.

³ Worship in the Christian Church (last sermon).

mass, in other words, that the sacrifice of Calvary is repeated each time. Payment is made for masses for the dead. No less than 1,700 were said in Madrid in one day for the wife of Philip III. of Spain. The queen gave orders, in her will, to have 1,000 said for her soul, and the king paid for 20,000 more. Cardinal Vaughan, when Bishop of Salford, said the usual fee in this country is five shillings, "but such is our charity and compassion for the souls of the poor that custom has sanctioned half-a-crown in their case." The Church of England is quite clear and definite about the sacrifice of masses. They are "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."¹ There is one objection that should appeal very strongly to those who care for the poor: they are at an enormous disadvantage compared with the rich. We could not, even if there were no other reason, accept a system which gives the rich more power than the poor to alleviate or shorten the period during which their dead are in the "waiting place." Of all class distinctions, this is the very worst. But let us see how the Romanist justifies his belief. His arguments weaken rather than strengthen his case. "Know ye not that they who wait at the altar are partakers with the altar"² will be pressed too far, if the words are made to counsel masses for money, and further, the words must not be removed from their context. It is true that "the labourer is worthy of his hire" upholds the giving of temporal support for spiritual service,

¹ Article 31.² 1 Cor. ix. 13.

but such service cannot be narrowed down to masses. One controversialist is particularly unfortunate in his illustration to show "the beginnings of the practice of making special offerings that the mass may be celebrated for a private intention."¹ He remarks that it throws some light upon the character and destination of the gifts made at the offertory. He quotes the story told by Gregory of Tours of two people of senatorial rank, a man and his wife, who, dying without children, left their property to the Church. The man died first, and the wife "relying upon the mercy of our Lord that the dead man would experience relief on the day she presented an offering for his soul, always brought a gallon of the wine of Gaza to the sanctuary of the holy basilica." The story goes on to relate that an unprincipled subdeacon kept the wine for his own gluttony and substituted some exceedingly sour vinegar in the chalice. "Since the woman herself did not always come up for the communion" the husband appeared to the wife, saying, "What has all my hard work in the world come to, that I should now supply vinegar for the offering?" When she awoke, wondering at this vision, she went to mass and "thereupon she drank from the chalice a draught of vinegar so acid that she thought her teeth would have been wrenched out of her head. In this way was the subdeacon's scandalous trickery put a stop to."²

¹ Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J., "Masses for Money," Catholic Truth Society, pp. 9-10.

² "In gloria Confessorum," chapt. 64; "Monumenta Germaniae, S.S. Merovingici," I., p. 786.

WHY I AM NOT A ROMAN CATHOLIC III

The reader must form his own opinion of, and conclusions from, this story. We will only make this comment, that the chalice was not at that time withheld from the laity !

Father Thurston tells us "it is easy to discover a certain appropriateness in attaching contributions to the saying of mass for a private intention. Complaint might more easily be made if a fee were required from all who wished to confess their sins, to receive Holy Communion, or to assist at the Holy Sacrifice. These are the ordinary channels of grace, and it would be a hardship indeed if they were inaccessible to the poor except after payment." ¹ We venture to think that the poor would rather forego all these than leave their loved ones to suffer in Purgatory for lack of money to get them out. The withholding of such benefit is the greater hardship. We notice that this same writer owns that "the existence of this inequality, so far at any rate as such a matter can be judged by what meets the outward eye, is not to be disputed." ² His argument that follows seems weak and unconvincing: "The inequality extends to the whole range of spiritual privileges . . . the rich seem to be favoured not only in the luxuries, but in the very essentials of religion . . . even after death the law 'to him that hath shall be given' seems still to hold, for the wealthy have many friends to ask prayers for them." No remarks of ours are here needed. The reader will judge for himself. We prefer to believe

¹ "Masses for Money," p. 14.

² Ibid. p. 18.

that benefits accrue to our loved ones "without money and without price," and we have greater hopes for the souls of the poor than is to be gained by the poor consolation that "it is a common opinion that the Holy Souls in Purgatory are only up to a certain point susceptible of help. What satisfactions are offered for them over and above that limited capacity are perhaps communicated, as we may piously believe, to those that are most destitute or most forgotten." ¹ According to this writer, apparently, the rich will need more expiation than the poor! and so will need "the better position," since "the Kingdom of heaven belongs of especial right to the poor, which means, no doubt, that they more readily find entrance there, and that their beatitude, when they reach it, is proportionately greater." ²

(9) *The Invocation of Saints.*

In the New Testament, a saint is synonymous with a Christian. Later, the word was used in a technical sense of those who had been canonized or enrolled in the list of those whose names were recited in connexion with the canon at the Holy Communion. The names of benefactors and of those who had borne special testimony to the faith were recited on special days, and the word was prefixed to those who had suffered martyrdom. The earliest example of formal canonization by a

¹ "Masses for Money," p. 19. ² Ibid. p. 20.

Pope dates probably from the ninth century. As time went on, erroneous and superstitious views were held, and the access of the soul to Christ was interfered with, and the help of canonized men and women was sought. In this way reliance was not placed solely upon the merits and intercession of Christ. At the Reformation certain names were struck out. The greater saints were commemorated with Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, and some sixty names of men and women were placed in the calendar whose lives were considered worthy of study and imitation. The Church venerates, but does not invoke, these saints. Invocation is not a primitive custom. The Reformers came to the conclusion that "it was not good and useful to pray to the saints in any manner." ¹

(10) *The Adoration of Relics.*

The Council of Trent declares that the relics of the saints are to be venerated, and so they are exhibited with lights burning upon the altar. This was almost universal before the Reformation. At Reading there were the spear which pierced the Saviour's side, and a bone of Mary Magdalene. At Bury St. Edmunds were pieces of the Cross, at Farley Abbey a girdle belonging to Mary Magdalene. Visitors abroad are taken to see all kinds of relics, and, sad to say, some of the most absurd are shown in the Holy City. We need only add that there are

¹ Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury.

two seamless coats of Christ, two bodies of S. Bartholomew, seven handkerchiefs with which Veronica, according to legend, wiped the face of Jesus. While we admire the simple reverence of the pilgrims, we cannot accept as authentic or worship these and other relics.

(II) *Confession.*

The Roman teaching makes it compulsory. It is a condition of receiving forgiveness. The Church of England allows it where and when it is required, but it is not compulsory, and it is not necessary to God's forgiveness. We should bear this distinction in mind. Some English Churchmen would seem to think that under no circumstance whatever should actual confession be allowed. This is to ignore the plain teaching of the Prayer Book. In the face of this teaching we cannot say there is no priestly function. Absolution is authorized in morning and evening prayer, in the beautiful yet simple words of the Holy Communion Service,¹ in the Visitation of the Sick, and in the Ordination to the priesthood. The Reformers did not abolish it. Cranmer said: "God hath given the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven and the authority to forgive sins to the ministers of the Church. Wherefore let him that is a sinner go to one of them; let him acknowledge and confess his sin, and pray him that, according to God's command-

¹ See first exhortation.

ments, he will give him absolution, and comfort him with the word of grace, and forgiveness of his sins. And when the minister did so, then I ought steadfastly to believe that my sins are truly forgiven me in heaven.”¹ Latimer says in one of his sermons: “To speak of right and true confession, I would to God it were kept in England, for it is a good thing . . . and sure it grieveth me much that such confessions are not kept in England.”² Ridley wrote: Confession unto the minister . . . I have ever thought might do much good to Christ’s congregation, and so, I assure you, I think even at this day.”³

“We want no man between us and God” is one of those shallow sayings that sound plausible. If such a man be a barrier between us and God, like the Disciples who would have kept the children from Christ, then indeed we want none such, but if and when such a man is a steward of the mysteries, and dispenses these to us, then we have need of him.

The words of the Ordination Service are explicit, and they are the words of Jesus Christ. The morning and evening service “Absolution” states quite clearly that the priest has power and authority to pronounce it, while at the same time it safeguards the supreme dignity and power of Him Who is the source of the authority thus exercised. The Church of England leaves the responsibility with her children. There is no compulsion, and those clergy

¹ Cranmer’s Catechism, p. 202.

² Sermons, Vol. II., p. 852.

³ Letter to Master West.

who enforce it before Confirmation and Holy Communion are disloyal to her teaching. There is no stern "must," but a loving "may." This means of grace is remedial and not habitual. We have no right to explain away or to repudiate truths that are clearly defined in the Prayer Book. There may be some priests unfitted by youth, inexperience, disposition, or even character to hear confessions. It is within the power and province of a Bishop to say so, provided the needs of the people are adequately met. We must not be led away by misrepresentations about the confessional. There are evangelicals who, in effect, hear confessions in their study, when people in trouble or doubt come to pour out their hearts to the man they trust. In a sense we all of us have at times received people's confessions. There is no more danger or horror of confession in the open church than in a private talk in vestry or study. Both High and Low Churchmen are doing their best to help the souls of their people.

We have said enough to show that the differences between Roman Catholic and Anglican Catholic Churchmen are real and fundamental. There is no need to say anything savouring of bigotry or narrow-mindedness against the Romanists; and we can testify that for the most part they adhere to their faith consistently and conscientiously, and in this respect are an example to backboneless Christians of other denominations. Let us be careful to know and understand the fundamental and essential differences between us, and avoid calling that which

is common to both of us exclusively Roman. We who trace our lineage through the centuries, and boldly affirm that we still hold, without addition to, or subtraction from, "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," have nothing to fear from the Roman Church, which has so constantly altered the tenets of her faith. For over fifteen hundred years any unbaptized person could have been received into the Church, East or West, if with the right disposition he accepted the Apostles' or the Nicene Creed. In the sixteenth century he would have been refused admission to the Roman Communion if he did not accept the creed of Pius IV. Since 1854 denial of the Immaculate Conception would exclude him, and since 1870 infallibility has been an article of faith without which he is not accepted. Under the theory of development no one can be sure when the next pious opinion will become an essential article of faith, to the detriment of the test of Catholicity as defined by Vincent of Lerins.

A Lesson from Rome.

The fact remains that in spite of her errors we are greatly indebted to the Church of Rome, and we need not be afraid to acknowledge the debt. She has been, and is, the great witness to the Supernatural. We may not like her hard-and-fast, clear-cut definitions, but we must admire her apprehension of, and emphasis upon, the Supernatural. Perhaps also we may learn from her democratic characteristics.

We churchmen, or some of us, are a little afraid that we are the Church of the well-to-do, for whom, in many cases, we provide cushioned seats for payment, and our poor are in the side aisles by favour rather than by right. It is not so in the Roman churches. The poor are there by right and the church is their spiritual home. Comparisons are odious, but can we confidently compare our English cathedrals with those in Italy, or our churches with theirs at home?

CHAPTER III.

WHY I AM NOT A DISSENTER.

Former Sloth of the Mother Church.

THE honest student of Church history will never allow himself to forget that while, as churchmen, we deeply deplore the innumerable company of sects, "some of them so small as to be almost insects," as one of their ministers has recently said,¹ and we lament the dissensions and disputes, the bitterness and jealousy that exist between them, we long to end a state of things that brings anarchy and confusion among Christians, and gives the common enemy cause to blaspheme in scorn and ridicule; yet the fact remains that dissent originated in the slackness and sloth of the Mother Church.² The Church's coldness and unspirituality, if an apology for dissent, should not have been a reason for it. It had been better if dissent had strengthened and invigorated the Mother Church. Instead, it deserted her, and, since "union is strength," by dissension weakened her. Quite recently there was a letter in the *Guardian* from a Wesleyan Minister,³

¹ Dr. Fort Newton, City Temple, 1916.

² Read "The Memories of Dean Hole."

³ Rev. H. T. Hooper, Whitby.

which was really an autobiography. Dare we deny its truth? Must we not acknowledge it as rather typical of the nineteenth century? "Why am I now a Methodist minister?" he asks, and he answers his own question by saying: "The village in which I was a child knew little or nothing of vital religion except what was to be found at the Methodist chapel. There was a fine old parish church with carved oak pews, in some of which I have seen the gravediggers' tools stowed away, together with brooms and other litter. There was what now would be called an altar, on which I have written my name with my finger in the dust that lay thick upon its faded cloth cover. There was a parson who conducted one service on a Sunday and absolutely none at all during the rest of the week. . . . There was no such thing as a Sunday school or a day school; these were both found only at the Methodist chapel. I never so much as heard the word 'Confirmation,' and am certain the thing never happened." Yet this man evidently has no prejudices against the Church, and he expresses his love for her. It is with sadness rather than bitterness that he writes: "The Church first neglected to prepare me for Confirmation, and now repels me because I have not been confirmed."

Intolerance.

The twentieth century should have seen an end of intolerance and uncharitableness, but, un-

fortunately, this is not yet the case, and the bigotry and bitterness are not all on one side. Looking back into the pages of past history we read that Archbishops Parker and Whitgift persecuted the Puritans, and the Puritan, Baxter, wrote in turn: "I abhor unlimited toleration, or any toleration at all." Lord Macaulay tells us that at the Rebellion, when the star of the Presbyterians was in the ascendant, "it was a crime for a child to read by the bedside of a sick parent one of those beautiful collects which have soothed the griefs of forty generations of Christians."¹ Cramp's "Baptist History" tells how the Independents or Congregationalists barbarously whipped Obadiah Holmes for being a Baptist. Mr. Spurgeon once stated at a meeting that the Baptists were the only Christians who never persecuted, but when the applause had subsided he added that "the reason was they had never had the chance!" Quakers were beaten, expelled, imprisoned, and even hanged. We need no reminder that to-day there is much want of charity between Church and Sect, and we will not attempt to apportion the blame or the measure of it.

All Aiming at the Same Place.

While we may determine that we will never intentionally speak bitterly, uncharitably, or unjustly of those who differ from us, this does not mean that we are to think it does not matter what we believe,

¹ "History of England," Pop. Ed., p. 79.

or where we worship. To borrow an illustration from political life, no Conservative joins a Liberal club, and *vice versa*. But why not? asks one who is perhaps too slack, too lazy, or too indifferent. If he argues that both are aiming at the same end, the government of his country, the convinced politician will retort, "That may be so, but my party will govern the Empire in the best possible way."

Consistent Loyalty.

This is just what the staunch Churchman or Dissenter should feel, if he has thought out his position and is convinced of his views. We find from experience that a man is respected when he firmly supports his opinions, and such an one, in return, respects those who are equally conscientious and firm, though they differ from him. The Dissenter who forfeits respect is one who pretends to be a Churchman to get a job or to gain a customer; who poses as "a bit of both," and as having "no quarrel with either"; who has his girl confirmed because "she will have a better chance of a situation"; who allows his baby's name to be placed on the "Cradle Roll" of a Baptist Sunday school, and then proceeds to have it baptized in the parish church; who "plays fast and loose" with vows and promises at baptism and confirmation, and now goes to the chapel because the vicar offended him. The Dissenter who gains the respect of staunch churchmen is he who conscientiously believes that at his chapel he receives the full message of the gospel, all the privileges,

helps, and blessings of religion, and who believes that the ministry, sacraments, and faith therein taught are in accord with the Word of God and the teaching of Christ and His Apostles ; who bravely defends his opinions and supports his chapel at all costs, under all circumstances, and against all opposition ; who strengthens the hands of the minister and officials by his presence and his purse, by his prayers and his example ; who strives to do his duty to his God and to his neighbour, and who " can look the whole world in the face for he owes not any man " ; who is a kind husband, a good father, an upright man, and a trusted friend, dedicating himself and all he has to the service of God for Christ's sake. There are many such, and they are honoured and respected. We are not, on this account, Dissenters, because we believe that within the Church of England we have all the opportunities that are provided in the chapel, whether of conversion, prayer, or worship, and a good deal more besides. From the cradle to the grave the Church watches over and provides for her children. Is there fear of the taint of heredity ? They are brought to the House of God, a few weeks old, that they may be washed, and are " born again," and received into covenant with God, by the rite of baptism, and in obedience to Christ's command : " Go ye therefore into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature ; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," ¹ and " Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them

¹ Mark xvi. 15, 16.

in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”¹ Unconscious of the privilege, yet they receive it, as Jewish children receive their privileges in the outward sign of circumcision, of which they are unconscious. In the Church schools they are taught the Christian faith. At a critical age, when boys and girls are about to take their part in the work of the world and to know something of its dangers and its snares and we fear some of the dangers of their environment, they are fortified by the grace of Confirmation, as in the days of the Apostles, when they that had been baptized received the Holy Ghost.² As communicants they receive the strength and inspiration of the Holy Communion, an act of obedience and a symbol of their loyalty to Him crucified. “This do in remembrance of Me,” was the Saviour’s injunction. To neglect Communion is to disobey Him. Are we guilty of sins that weigh us down, and we must confide in some one? The ministry of absolution is provided. Why are people so suspicious of priestcraft? There is none when sinners repair to the penitent form of the Salvation Army.

Dissenter or Nonconformist?

It is sometimes asked: “Why do you call us Dissenters? We object to the term and prefer to be called Nonconformists!” We use the term

¹ Matt. xxviii. 19.

² Acts viii. 17; xix. 6.

not in any spirit of uncharitableness, but in its historical and therefore accurate signification. Nonconformity claimed to be the real churchmanship ; it did not dream of separation from the Church of England. It objected to the ritual and ceremonial, but it defended the doctrines of the Church of England. The separated religious denominations of to-day are not Nonconformists, for they cannot be nonconformist in relation to that to which they never belonged, and to which they have never conformed. They are Dissenters. They have set up places of worship in opposition to or in addition to the parish churches. The original Nonconformists did not do this, for they were churchmen who conformed to the essence or distinctive nature of the Church, but not to its accidents or non-essentials. In the words of Richard Baxter : " The most sober and learned Nonconformists, notwithstanding their scruples on some points, yet utterly condemned separation from our Church as sinful." After calling themselves Dissenters for at least two hundred years, our separatist brethren now feel hurt if we address them thus, and they prefer a title to which they have no rightful historical claim. We read in history how Dissenters and Nonconformists disputed each other's attitude. The Nonconformists, anxious to avoid divisions, urged the Dissenters not to separate from the Church ; the Dissenters on their part urged the Nonconformists to separate.

Schism.

It is because the Dissenters have separated from the one body that they are in schism, from which, in the Litany, we pray to be delivered. Derived from the Greek, *schism* means a division or separation. Schismatic sounds an ugly word, but it means "pertaining to schism." "But," says the Dissenter, "we belong to the Church, and are the Church, just as much as you are."

Are the Differences Vital?

Now, it is absurd to pretend that the points of doctrine that divide Church and Sect have no vital importance. Regret it as much as you will, denounce it as much as you will, refuse to acknowledge it if you like, the fact remains, and every parish priest faithfully labouring in his vocation knows the fact, that between Dissent and the Church there is a vital contradiction. Individuals who are free from the task and problem of teaching may affect to forget the points of divergence, and only recognize the common elements in discipleship; but this is impossible in teachers.¹ Either our differences are real and important or they are not. For a Churchman to say they are not is to utter a cruel indictment of Dissent, and when Dissenters take up this position they condemn their forefathers by implication that the grounds of separation were

¹ Dr. Hensley Henson's open letter to Archdeacon Sinclair, March, 1892.

and are negligible. We have been told by one leading Dissenter that "it is nothing in religion that divides S. Andrew's of the Church of England from Stamford Hill Congregational Church. It is not any religious doctrine at all. What is it then? It is a State device, a political makeshift invented by Thomas Cromwell and Henry VIII., and the secular counsellors of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth, and her worldly wise politicians,"¹ We doubt if this Dissenter carries many even of his own denomination with him in these views. Much more to the point is the clear statement of religious differences made by another Dissenting minister, who says: "I dissent from the Anglican Church because of its ministry based on Apostolic succession, and because the authority of the Anglican Church rests on her rubrics and canons . . . not canons, rubrics, church catechisms or prayer books, but 'Thus saith the Lord.'"² This minister says definitely and distinctly, "I dissent from them and they dissent from me."

Modern Distinctions.

It is the essential differences that count. Nowadays the Dissenters call their places of worship churches. Formerly they were content to call them chapels as a distinctive title and as a sign of separation. It is of interest also to note how in

¹ Rev. Dr. Morgan Gibbon.

² Rev. G. Anderson Miller, *Chatham News*, Nov. 28, 1905.

some cases the Dissenters have completely contradicted their special tenet or characteristic. The Quaker professes to abhor all externalism, and yet of all others he is recognized by distinctive garb and stilted speech. The Congregationalists have yielded their first principle, independency, in the Congregational Union. The Wesleyans are scarcely followers of John Wesley to-day. Plymouthism began by the recognition of all Christians as brethren, and now excommunicates every one not of itself, and thus beginning by being most liberal has ended by being most exclusive. Dissenters in general are not slow to inveigh against sacerdotalism, and contend that no man may come between God and man, yet they think highly of the man: they "sit under Mr. So-and-so," and the sermon is predominant. As Dr. Forsyth says: "Our idolatry of the popular preacher needs to be balanced by more stress on the sacraments."¹ Our spired churches were derisively called "steeple houses" in days gone by, but now the Dissenters imitate our architecture in every possible way. In these days adherents of Dissent are being taught, in some cases, that their particular denomination is not a split from the historic Church of the country, but has not only an equal status, but also a lengthy lineage. In an article written some few years ago existence was claimed for the Baptist sect as far back as the fifth century,² and we have known

¹ "The Church and the Sacraments."

² Rev. J. S. Hughes, "The Oldest Free Church in the British Isles."

Dissent to be claimed direct from John the Baptist ! Dissenters of the old school would not recognize the titles or the buildings if they could see them to-day.

An Appeal to the New Testament.

Dissenters are not too ready to listen to the testimony of Church history or of patristic writings. They would bind us to the Scriptures. Even so ! If they are a Scriptural Church let them produce their credentials !

While it is in accord with the New Testament idea to speak of the Church of England, or of the Church in London, it is against it to speak of a particular Church. All Christians belonged to the one Church of the place. There was only one. As Dr. Forsyth says of his fellow-Dissenters, "They have been much too atomist," and thus "they lose the sense of the great Church . . . What the gospel created was not a crowd of Churches, but the one Church in various places."¹ We know what St. Paul asked when the people of his day followed a man and had a party cry,² "Is Christ divided ?" We do not read in the New Testament of the Brownist, or Baptist, or Wesleyan Church. Why not ?

Dissent Modern and Man-made.

Because these and similar Churches are modern

¹ "The Church and the Sacraments."

² 1 Cor. i. 12: "I am of Apollos, and I of Cephas."

and man-made. The names of their founders are recorded in history. The Independents or Congregationalists, who set up a congregation at Wandsworth in 1569, were founded as a sect by Robert Browne in 1570, and have been sometimes called Brownists. At first they were known as "Separatists," and their reason for separation is not a little remarkable. They argued that it would not have been lawful to leave the Church if it were a Church, but its corruption, they said, made it a synagogue of Satan. The Brownists were followed in 1571 by the Romanists, who up to this time attended our churches, but when Pope Pius IV. excommunicated Elizabeth, he forbade his followers to share in our services or to listen to our clergy. The Baptists or Anabaptists separated from the Brownists in 1633, and later split into two main branches; the general Baptists were opposed to Calvinism, and the Particular Baptists strangely favoured it. The Friends were founded by a cattle drover named George Fox in 1644, and were satisfied neither with the Church nor with the existing Dissenters. The Socinians were founded by Socinus, an Italian, and denied the Divinity and Atonement of Christ. They were the precursors of the Unitarians. The Calvinistic Methodists began in 1737 and were founded by George Whitfield. The Wesleyan Methodists sprang from John Wesley, and broke away from the Church in 1795, four years after his death. The first Society of Brethren was formed in the

city of Dublin in 1830. In 1831 a society was formed in Plymouth, hence the name of "Plymouth Brethren," and they afterwards spread to the continent of Europe, to America and Australia, and are now divided into several parties, the most numerous and powerful of which are the Derbyites and Exclusives. Thus has it come to pass that instead of one community there are between two and three hundred sects. They have not made and they could not make for unity.

The Teaching of John Wesley.

Of all these many denominations it is, perhaps, not unfair to say that the Wesleyans have the least satisfactory foundation, and the smallest claim to the name of their founder. John Wesley said and taught, with reiterated vehemence and emphasis, that his followers must on no account separate from the Church. "Remove every tendency thereto with all diligence," were his words. In 1768 he declared, "We are so far from being enemies to the Church that we are rather bigots to it. I dare not leave the Church and go to an Independent meeting. I advise all over whom I have any influence to keep to the Church." In 1777, "We do not, we will not, form any separate sect, but from principle remain what we have always been, true members of the Church of England." In 1780, "Having deeply considered the several sorts of Dissenters at home, I am fully convinced our own Church is nearer the scriptural

plan than any other Church in Europe." In 1783, "In every possible way I have advised the Methodists to keep to the Church." In 1788, "The more I reflect the more I am convinced that the Methodists ought not to leave the Church. Our glory has hitherto been, not to be a separate body." In 1789 (two years before his death), "In God's name, stop! . . . Ye were called in the Church of England, and though you have and will have a thousand temptations to leave it, and set up for yourselves, regard them not; be Church of England men still." He himself never left it. He lived and died an ordained priest of it, and on December 11, 1789, he wrote: "I will live and die a member of the Church of England, and none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it." He expressed the belief that "if the Methodists leave the Church, God will leave them." Not long before his death he wrote in his diary this entry: "Most of the leading men of the society were mad for separating from the Church. I endeavoured to reason with them, but in vain. At length, after meeting the whole society I told them, 'If you are resolved, you may have your service in Church hours, but remember, from that time you will see my face no more.' " The following are some of John Wesley's rules: Warn all against calling our Society a Church, or the Church against calling our preachers ministers. Call our houses preaching-houses. Let all the servants in all our preaching-houses go to Church on Sunday morn-

ings at least. Let every preacher go always on Sunday morning, and when he can in the afternoon. Let all our people go to church and receive the sacrament at every opportunity. Some will say our service is public service. Yes, in a sense, but not such as supersedes the Church service. We never designed that it should. We have a hundred times professed the contrary. John Wesley was always most particular to distinguish between clergymen and his preachers. He addressed letters to "Mr. John Smith" at the Preaching-house, and to "The Reverend Mr. John Smith" at the Rectory. In the year 1790 he summoned his preachers to the City Road Preaching-house, and preached to them the well-known "Korah" sermon, in the course of which he said: "Let it be well observed on what terms we receive them (the preachers); we receive them wholly and solely to preach and not to administer the sacraments. Did we ever appoint you to administer sacraments or exercise the priest's office? Such a design never entered our minds. It was the farthest from our thoughts. I wish all of you who are vulgarly called Methodists would seriously consider what has been said, particularly you whom God hath commissioned to call sinners to repentance. It does by no means follow from hence that ye are commissioned to baptize or to administer the Lord's Supper; ye never dreamed of this for ten or twenty years after ye began to preach; ye did not then, like Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, seek the priesthood also. Ye knew

no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. Oh! contain yourselves within your own bounds; be content with preaching the gospel." On the memorial tablet to John Wesley, in the City Road Chapel, is an inscription stating, "He was the founder of Methodist Societies, and the chief promoter and patron of the plan of itinerant preaching." This is not the original wording, which used to be: "Founder of the Methodist Societies, and the patron and friend of the lay preachers." Why was the original inscription altered, and what is the significance of the alteration?

On another occasion John Wesley had spoken strongly against his preachers administering the Holy Communion. "You believe it is a duty to administer; I verily believe it is a sin, which consequently I dare not tolerate."¹

In the opinion of some Wesleyans to-day "the Korah sermon is no more binding upon them than his little work on primitive physic is binding." This may be so, but it is an acknowledgment that they have wandered from the teaching of the sermon. In 1784, Coke, his coadjutor, volunteered for service in America, if Wesley would commission him. Wesley laid his hands also on two lay preachers, who were to serve as presbyters, and some ministers for Scotland, but if he claimed the power to ordain, he used it very sparingly, and he appears to have been ashamed of his action, and Dr. Coke

¹ Magazine, 1779, p. 649.

afterwards sought re-ordination. Charles Wesley's words on the matter are well-known :

How easy now are Bishops made
By man or woman's whim ;
Wesley his hands on Coke hath laid,
But who laid hands on him ?

It is not easy to understand by what process of evolution lay preachers and preaching-houses have developed into clergymen and churches, but the breach was made gradually, and the spirit of absolute loyalty to the Mother Church died slowly. In 1795 the preachers began to administer the communion. In 1836 preachers were ordained by the laying on of hands. In 1892 Wesleyanism rejected the title of "Society" and assumed that of the "Church," and perhaps the union of the Wesleyans with the "Free Church Movement" has still further widened the severance. Recently a writer¹ has been endeavouring to show that to Wesley himself must be attributed the Wesleyan schism, and that it was not contrary to his wishes or intentions, but, in view of his opinions expressed above, it will be difficult to prove the contention.

Be that as it may, a hopeful sign of the desire for reunion was found at the Wesleyan Conference, held at Plymouth, at which a committee was elected to collect information and to report to the next conference, in view of the possibility of uniting in one church organization the different branches of

¹ Rev. E. W. Watson, "A New History of Methodism."—*Church Quarterly Review*.

British Methodism. A further motion proposed that "before any steps be taken for corporate union with other branches of Methodism, enquiry be made as to whether union could be effected with the Mother Church of England." This latter was really an amendment, and as such was lost, but nevertheless it was a sign of a future possibility, for which many pray.

The Reason for our Churchmanship.

In our reasons for being Catholic Churchmen we stated our belief in the threefold ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in Infant Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Communion. We maintained that the faith of the Church of England as laid down in her creeds and formularies is in accord with the Catholic Faith of early centuries, which, in turn, agrees with the doctrine of Christ as handed down by the Apostles. We cannot belong to one of the sects of the Dissenters, all of whom have given up Confirmation, while the Baptists have rejected Infant Baptism, and most Dissenters lay but little stress upon it. The question of Apostolic succession is a difficult one, and is a great barrier between Church and Sect, but it will be conceded, at any rate, that the way to the ministry should be safeguarded by the conferment of authority, which has been the universal practice in the Christian Church for fifteen centuries. In the domain of secular work and duties, we decide upon our career, but before we

enter upon it there is a contract or commission, a document or an authority. Take, as illustration, the office of a magistrate. Many of us feel, and no doubt with some justification, that we are as qualified to be justices of the peace as those who have been appointed to the office, but as the lord lieutenant has not recommended us, we have no right or authority to act as a magistrate. It is a question of authority, not of fitness. Others may be equally suitable, but they do not hold the commission. When we look into the Bible we find there was an inward and an outward call. The Holy Spirit spoke to the heart, and there was a laying on of hands by one in authority.¹ God is not tied to means; His grace is given through many channels; but this does not prove that He has appointed neither means nor channels. S. Paul had his ordination direct from God, but the New Testament gives explicit directions for ordinary occasions.²

If S. Paul could come to England To-day

By way of testing the faith and practice of the Church of England, I will ask you to imagine that S. Paul could come back to earth, and desire to send a letter to the Church in Rochester, as he did in his own day to "the Church which is at Corinth." Into whose hands would the letter be given? That might depend upon the "religious persuasion" of the postman. But if, instead of sending a letter,

¹ Acts xiii. 2.

² 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Tim. iii.; Titus i. 5.

the Apostle decided to visit the city, how mystified and muddled he would be when, with a guide he set out to see how the work of the Church was progressing. Let us suppose he visited the assembled Christians in each place of worship. The guide would take him to the Salvation Army barracks. The methods in vogue there would surprise him, but he would be still more surprised when he enquired for the Elders, and was taken instead to Adjutants and Captains. He would not recognize these ranks of the ministry. And when he began to ask whether these assembled Christians were increasing their numbers by the enrolment of members, through baptism, how amazed he would be to hear that they did not baptize their adherents, but instead waved a flag over them! And if he asked whether they followed Christ's dying command, "Take, eat, this is My Body," "This is My Blood," and they replied that they "never did this in the Army," what would he think? Then imagine him being taken to the "Baptist Church." The word "Baptist" would be familiar, but here he would find that the infant is worse off, under the Christian dispensation, and the covenant is less merciful than under the Jewish law. The Jewish babe receives a privilege, though quite unconscious of it at the time, but it is denied to the Christian babe. Next he might visit the "Congregational Church," and in the course of his enquiry might ask, "Do the Bishops come here from time to time to lay their hands upon those that are baptized, that they may receive

the Holy Ghost in confirmation, as the Apostles which were at Jerusalem sent Peter and John to Samaria in my day? ”¹ The reply, “ We do not have the laying on of hands in confirmation here,” would be strangely disconcerting. Then the Apostle might be taken to the “ Wesleyan Church.” “ How came you by this name? ” he might ask. “ We are called by the name of our founder, John Wesley,” would be the answer, and it would be reminiscent of an attitude he had rebuked. Then, it was “ I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas ” ; now, it is “ I am of John Wesley.” Is Christ divided? He would regret to know that they had departed far from even their human founder’s intentions and ideas, in being thus estranged from the one Catholic and Apostolic Church. Sadly would the Apostle journey on, till he came to the Roman Catholic Church, in time for Mass, or Holy Communion as the Church of England calls it. If he went with those who were to partake of the Symbolic Elements he would receive the bread, but the wine of the chalice would be withheld. Would he not wonder what had become of “ He took the cup . . . drink ye *all* of this,” and of the exhortation of his own, “ As often as ye drink this cup ” ? If he expressed any surprise he would be told “ Oh, the chalice has been denied to the laity since the Council of Constance in 1415.” It might perhaps be some little consolation to the Apostle that the “ old way ” had at any rate been observed for 1,400 years. Next,

¹Acts viii. 14-17.

he might visit the "Unitarian Church," and there he would find that He, whom St. Peter declared to be "Christ the Son of God," and received the Master's commendation for his statement of a mighty truth, was not counted as Divine, but that only God the Father received from these worshippers the homage due to Divinity. Wearied and perplexed by these diversities of faith, the Apostle might possibly ask, "How many different sects of Christians are there?" What would he think of the reply "Oh, over 250, and the number is still increasing!" Imagine his despair! But his guide might say, "There is time to visit one more place of worship, let me take you to a parish church." Here he might meet the vicar, but would almost fear to put his questions, lest the answers would be unfamiliar. "What is your office?" he would ask, and the vicar would answer: "I am an Elder, a Presbyter or Priest." "By whom ordained and how?" "By the Bishop or Chief Pastor, with the laying on of hands, as Timothy and Titus ordained of old." The Apostle would be reassured. "Have you any deacons here?" "Yes, one of my fellow-workers is only lately ordained, 'to preach and to baptize,' as Philip did at Samaria.¹ Our Bishops ordain men as deacons and priests four times a year, to go forth and serve in the sacred ministry, and at these times prayer is offered in the Church that the Bishops may 'lay hands suddenly on no man,' as you yourself

¹ Acts viii. 12.

instructed Timothy." "Do you make disciples by baptizing?" "Yes, yonder is the Font, and in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, we baptize." "Do you fulfil the Saviour's last command 'Take, eat; drink ye all; do this in remembrance'?" "Yes, frequently, every Lord's Day, and Saint's Day, when some of the faithful gather at yonder rails to receive the bread and wine, administered with these words 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee,' and 'The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee . . . drink this in remembrance . . . and be thankful.'" "Is there also a laying on of hands to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost?" "Oh, yes, in the cathedral and in the various churches, our Bishop lays his hands upon the baptized, as Peter did at Samaria, and we believe they receive thereby the Holy Ghost." I imagine the Apostle would say "At last I have found the Church as I knew it in my days." This is the reason why I am a Churchman and not a Dissenter.

We can Learn from Each Other.

But we Churchmen must frankly and gladly recognize that the Dissenters have done and are doing a great spiritual work, and we must be prepared to admit that we can learn much from them, and not least the importance they attach to the

pulpit, their better realization of brotherhood in their chapel, their realization that their people must be taught to give and to work, their readiness to modify, modernize, and adapt their services to present needs. The Dissenters too are ready to acknowledge they can learn much from us, from our liturgical forms, our spiritual values, our sacramental system. It is worth while considering how far each can surrender something in the interest of and in the desire for some such measure of unity as has been evidenced in other directions in and through this war. And as a beginning we must get rid of our own party spirit.

CHAPTER IV.

WHAT IS A HIGH, A LOW, A BROAD CHURCHMAN?

Parties.

IF, as we believe and know, dissent has caused disunion, it is far more sad and regrettable to know there is bickering and quarrelling, prejudice and jealousy among churchmen.

If we must speak of the High Church Party, the Low Church Party, and the Broad Church Party, let us do so only in a restricted sense. We must not forget that, to whatever party we belong, we are all churchmen, bound by the same oaths and promises at ordination, and all owing allegiance to the one Prayer Book.

Minor Differences.

It is very foolish and very ignorant to squabble over minor differences of ritual, thought, and practice: foolish, because it gives the enemy cause to blaspheme; ignorant, because it manifests an incapacity to understand the distinction between the essential and non-essential.

Intelligible Differences.

It is not unintelligible that there should be some difference of opinion among churchmen. Such differences are apparent even among the apostles, who seem to have approached certain questions from different points of view. S. John contemplates heavenly realities by faith; S. Peter is concerned with a person; S. Paul, realizing that many laid too much stress upon the works of the law, emphasized faith; S. James, afraid that mere orthodoxy might become a fetish, urges the need of works; but each would acknowledge the view of the other to be valuable.

Special Aspects.

It is almost inevitable that each one, according to temperament or training, will lay special emphasis on some one aspect of the faith, which, nevertheless, he holds in its entirety. Among such aspects are authority, sacramentalism, collectivism, individualism, and emotionalism. Thus in the three parties we have a Broad Church to emphasize brotherhood, a Low Church to manifest individual experience, and a High Church to proclaim authority. The Catholic churchman should hold each and all of these, and rise above a party, for the Church is comprehensive enough to include all aspects. Let there be unity in essentials, liberty in non-essentials, and charity in all things. If we must cling to a party, let us realize that it is a part and only a part

of a great whole. A party may be for good, but party spirit is always bad, and in any case a party must be both in outlook and numbers narrower than the Church, which has a width and a breadth, a height and a depth sufficient to make a happy religious house for many men and diverse views. We must interpret ourselves to each other, that each party may learn from the others.

No Narrow Suspicion or Ignorance.

Then we shall put an end to suspicion, narrow-mindedness, and ignorance. We shall not call a church "almost Roman Catholic" because there are six lights on the altar, and we are only accustomed to two, for we shall know that 106 candles will not make it Roman Catholic. We shall not be thoughtless and stupid if in the Nicene Creed the people kneel at the words "was incarnate of the Virgin Mary, and was made man," and we shall not call it silly or "High Church," because we shall have the sense to understand that these people are prompted to kneel as they contemplate the great mystery of God taking flesh and becoming man. We have no right to make accusations of idolatry against those who, according to the canons of 1640, bow to the altar, or who incline their head when they say "Glory be to the Father" in obedience to an old canon of the Church.¹ There is no need to deem one a Ritualist who turns to the east in the Creed,

¹ Wilkins, "Concilia," iii. 20.

for apart from the object-lesson of unity, when all turn in one and the same direction to repeat "the articles of the Christian Faith," there is in the practice, which dates from the earliest Christian times, a survival of the time when heathens were converted to the Christian faith, and when presented for baptism in the early morning were placed facing west, where the shadow of departing night still hung, and, having renounced their sin and unbelief, turned to the east to face the first rays of morning light, symbolic of the Light of the World, Whom henceforth they followed. Contrariwise, we must refrain from any desire "to burn at the stake" those who assume the "Northward position" at Communion, or who decline to follow this or that custom.

What each "Party" stands for.

It is doubtful whether the majority of people have any clear and intelligent idea of the difference between the three parties, and of what, precisely, on enquiry, each one stands for. All kinds of curious opinions on the matter are expressed. Generally speaking, it is thought that the High Churchman exalts the sacraments, takes very little account of matins and evensong, and favours externals, while the Low Churchman lays stress on sermons and prayer meetings, avoids "man-millinery," and the accessories of altar candles and the like, and does not lay too much emphasis upon the sacraments, and the

Broad Churchman is very broad-minded, and lets everyone do and believe pretty much what he likes. With such definitions, it is not surprising that the Broad Churchman is rather a favourite!

It is recorded that on one occasion a chaplain asked a soldier what the difference was, and was told that if a man goes to Communion early and often he is a High Churchman, if he goes sometimes to church and sometimes to chapel he is a Low Churchman, and if he never goes to church or chapel he is a Broad Churchman.¹ Again, the Broad Churchman would seem to be popular! Another common and rather foolish opinion is thus expressed: High Church people go in for surpliced choir, they sing the psalms and intone the service, wear coloured stoles, have lighted candles, turn to the east and bow to the altar, and you cannot tell the difference between them and the Romanists. Low Churchmen do not go in for a lot of show: they read the prayers, have no surpliced choir, avoid gorgeous robes and ornate services, and do not "bow and scrape." The Broad Churchman is one of those broad-minded sensible people who say it does not matter what anyone believes; he can think as he likes and do what he likes, because all are aiming at the same place. Again, it is to be feared this description favours the Broad Churchman, for popular fancy. There is just an element of truth in these crude views, but the chief point of difference is missed, and the essential aspect is lost. In

¹ *Church Times*, March, 1906.

order then to understand what is the main idea underlying each party, it will be well briefly to show the distinctive feature of each. The High Churchman takes pains to maintain the sacraments in the forefront of his teaching, strives to keep unbroken Apostolic institutions, and endeavours to add dignity, beauty, and reverence to worship. The Low Churchman makes prominent the relation of the human soul to God. He does not care a great deal about ritual or adornment, or any external aids to personal religion, and even the sacraments are not prominent with him. He stands for direct access of the soul through Christ without intermediary of sacrament, of penance, or of auricular confession to a priest, and for all that is taught in Article 6 on "the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for salvation." The Broad Churchman deals philosophically with Christianity, and concerns himself with its effect on men and morals, on science, intellect, and philosophy. He thinks little of the supernatural side, and a good deal of the effect of it in human lives. He cares less for the dogmatic and more for the practical, less for the emotional and more for the intellectual side of Christianity. Now, each of these aspects is not only justifiable but necessary. Christianity demands that we should obey Christ's commands to baptize, and to take Communion, and we should follow Apostolic practices. We cannot be too particular in the way we offer worship, no money can be wasted which is spent to beautify God's House; it should be, like the

Temple, "exceeding magnificent," for it is the Eternal God Whom we worship. "Let all things be done decently and in order." So far, we are High Churchmen. It must be the desire of every minister of God that each member of his congregation shall get into personal touch with God the Father, and Christ the Saviour, and that nothing and nobody shall come between the love of each one for Him. Thus, all should, so far, be in agreement with the Low Churchman. Our faith must help our daily life, our religion must mould our week-day as well as our Sunday thoughts and acts; we must apply Christ's principles and conduct to the problems, difficulties, and trials of to-day. We must treat science and philosophy as handmaids to religion, which has nothing to withhold and nothing to fear from their teaching. So far, we are at one with Broad Churchmen. But the best, the most complete and comprehensive churchman is he who while not unduly and too prominently pressing one special aspect, combines them all in his churchmanship, and believes that we owe it to the Catholic faith to do all in our power to obey the Founder of the Church; to render becoming honour to Him in His own appointed Sacraments and in His own special Tabernacle; also to bring our own self and others into close personal touch with the Saviour, using His Sacraments and His Temple as means thereto; and again that those who profess and call themselves Christians should show forth in their lives what they believe in their hearts and say with their lips.

With this broad and grand idea of churchmanship there will be no jealousy, animosity, discourtesy, or recrimination between one party and another. Do you think that because some clergyman has an elaborate service that therefore he does not believe in the personal touch between God and man, or that faith must affect practice? Do you think that because another uses a black stole, does not turn to the east in the Creed, nor take the eastward position at the Communion, and does not intone the service, he therefore thinks nothing of reverence in God's House, and ignores the human side of Christianity! Do you think because a third regards the human or practical point of view he does not believe in Church order or in the soul's relation to God? Certainly not. Remember then that each of us makes one aspect of truth especially prominent. It is quite natural. We have general practitioners and specialists, but each of them is a medical man. We send children to school for general education; some may take up a special course of study, yet they all are students. The clergy are called upon to teach and preach, to read and sing services, to organize clubs, to soothe the suffering and help the poor, to visit the sick and strengthen the doubter, but one is specially a preacher, another a visitor, another an organizer, and another a financier. So may the churchman agree with all parties, and yet give special prominence, through his upbringing or temperament or sympathy, to one special aspect. It is a pity, however, that clergy

should invite as special preachers only those of their own school of thought, for it gives people the idea that we are divided. It is a mistake also to intensify differences by a marked distinction of minor ritual or vestment. The clergyman who is used to a coloured stole need not refuse to wear a black one at the church where such is customary, for it is not a question of urgent and essential importance. How often one has seen an individual refuse to turn east at the "Gloria" or the Creed, when every one else is turning; it seems unnecessary to flaunt one's individual views in the face of every one else. I have no right to say that those who bow to the altar are idolaters, and accuse them of bowing to wood and stone. They hold the sacrament in high esteem, and the altar on which the elements are consecrated. "Christ is not there," I may say, but they who pass the throne in the House of Lords bow in their passing, though the King is not there, but they do not thereby worship it. It does not follow, of course, that only they who bow to the altar value the sacrament, but outward manifestation does not appeal to all alike. Or, think of the angry meetings of protest that have been held in parishes against the use of a Processional Cross, and charges of idolatry and of Romanizing have been levelled, as though anyone in his sober senses believes or can believe that where such is in use it is an object of worship. The mayor and corporation can "process" in their robes, and with them the mace is carried. Do our

“city fathers” worship this emblem of dignity and office? May Freemasons carry regalia, trades unions their banners, regiments their flags, without being charged with idolatry, while Christians may not carry the symbol of their redemption? Yet, I have met people, who are, ordinarily, educated, sensible, and reasonable, but who have actually refused to come into church on days when there was a processional hymn, until it has been concluded. When will people understand and learn that it is never probable that all can think alike, or that all characters and temperaments will be the same? It is unreasonable and impossible. Music helps one in devotion, and hinders another; one can worship better in a stately cathedral, another in an unpretentious mission church; one is strengthened by confiding in another, hence confession; one is independent and self-reliant, and would consider it weakness to lay bare a life’s secrets to another. Some need earthly guides and others do not; this one prefers to worship unaided, that one finds help in rules and forms. One can be devout without outward sign of it, another is impelled to show his devotion outwardly. Scarcely will any two people agree as to the pattern of a garment, the colour of a dress, the comparative beauty of a landscape, the gracefulness of a deportment. Is it likely that any congregation can be found in which every member of it would be content to have the service exactly as he finds it? Yet where there is broad toleration, sweet reasonableness, and a real appreciation of

the difference between essential and non-essential, there need never be, there never ought to be, the slightest friction and unpleasantness. To all who seek a splendid lesson of toleration S. Paul's message may well be commended.¹ He was writing to the Christians at Rome, and reminds them of differences that existed in their community, even or small and unimportant points of observance. Some valued one day more than another, others valued every day alike; some, through the influence of their Jewish training, drew a clear distinction between clean and unclean meats; others, remembering how S. Peter was forbidden to call any man common or unclean, applied this teaching to foods and drew no distinction. He exhorts them to toleration. There must be mutual trust, forbearance, and charity in unimportant and unessential matters. Let his advice be remembered and heeded to-day. If we must label ourselves, high, low, or broad, we churchmen must stand united in fundamentals, maintaining the doctrine of the Trinity, the three orders of the ministry: Infant Baptism and the Supper of the Lord as sacraments generally necessary to salvation, and Confirmation as the doctrine of Christ; in other words, we must accept the teaching of the "one Catholic and Apostolic Church," and then we shall be free to allow a service of ornate stateliness, or one of bleak and bare simplicity. Let no High Churchman speak uncharitably of his Low Church brother, as though he would deny him

¹ Rom. xiv.

the name and right of churchmanship, and let the Low Churchman, in his turn, not spread suspicion of this High Church brother by insinuating that each or any piece of harmless ritual is the "thin end of the wedge" and the opening of the gate to Rome. Our Church cannot afford to lose either of the three great parties; each of them has done good work in the past and is doing it still to-day. As we look back at the past, we can read the names of men of all schools of thought, honoured then and now, George Herbert, Bishop Ken and Jeremy Taylor, Barrow, Butler and Beveridge, are among High Churchmen; Venn, Simeon and Scott among Low Churchmen; and the renowned Paley among the Broad Churchmen. We can recall how in the sixteenth century the revival of learning brought free enquiry and the importance of truth prominently forward. Let us remember that in the dark days of the eighteenth century, when our old Church was a moral and spiritual failure, there came, by the Providence of God, the Evangelical or Low Church revival, and the men who took part in it were "the salt of the earth in their day. . . . It is necessary to bring out into full prominence their claims upon the admiration of posterity. . . . Every English churchman has reason to be deeply grateful to them for what they did, however much he may be of opinion that their work required supplementing by others no less earnest, but of a different tone of thought." ¹ Again, we cannot forget

¹ Overton, "English Church in the Eighteenth Century," p. 402.

that in the nineteenth century, when the Church had relapsed from earnestness and enthusiasm into dry and drear neglect, when parishioners "never saw the man to whom had been entrusted the spiritual charge of the parish . . . and a curate had lodgings five miles away and came once a week for one brief, cold, heartless service. My memory recalls him as he stands, with his overcoat, hat, and riding whip upon the Holy Table." ¹ The Oxford Movement altered all that, to which movement "despite some accompanying evils, the Anglican Church, under God's Providence, owes so much." ² Valuable testimony is paid to its work by a Presbyterian in these words: "One of the most obvious and also most pleasing (results) is the greatly increased sense of reverence which characterizes the services of the Church of England. The edifices are being cared for and adorned. . . . The care with which they are kept and the taste with which they are renovated dates largely from the time of the Oxford Movement." ³ In each case we have quoted an opinion from one who does not belong to the party which he praises.

Each party has scriptural authority for the position it defends, and each, in its turn, has rendered service in the darkest days of religion in this country, and, what is more encouraging, it will be found that there is far more that each holds in common than

¹ Memories of Dean Hole.

² Archdeacon Sinclair.

³ Dr. Niven, Moderator of the Presbyterian Establishment, in the "Muntle Lectures," at Aberdeen.

is sometimes believed. The Low Churchman has laid his emphasis upon the doctrine of the Fall and the Atonement, upon the Priesthood of Christ and the Sanctification of the Holy Ghost. These are dogmas upon which Catholic theology has laid stress at all times. À Kempis, Law, Keble, Pusey, Dolling, and Stanton were certainly High Churchmen, but it was their personal devotion to the Saviour that drew men of the Low Church Party, as well as Dissenters, to listen to their preaching. It was a Dissenter who said, "I don't care whether Dolling is a Ritualist or a Roman Catholic, he preaches Christ in a way I have never heard before, and hardly ever expect to hear again." It is more than likely that the majority think that a High Churchman has less sympathy with a Dissenter than a Low Churchman has, but a well-known Dissenter has left it on record that the social barrier which the Low Church clergyman placed between himself and the Dissenting minister was far more irksome than the ecclesiastical barrier placed by the High Churchman, since the latter was modified in most cases by personal kindness and social intercourse, even if principles, mutually respected, were not surrendered." ¹ We should strive to be intelligible to others, even as God is intelligible to us all. Some will make the sign of the cross. Why not? It is all to the good that one should be reminded of the Death of Christ on Calvary, of the obligation laid upon a Christian to bear his cross, of the call to

¹ Dr. Guinness Rogers, "Autobiography."

crucify the lusts of the flesh, and of the sign implanted on the brow at baptism and of its significance. We have no right to belittle the action of another, if such action is a help to the spiritual life. We are not justified in calling it idolatrous. But when outward acts are used either at Divine Service or in private life, it is of the utmost importance that they should be used intelligently and as a help to devotion. We have no sympathy with irritating instructions, as sometimes found in manuals,¹ nor is it right to draw unfair conclusions in an endeavour to give instructions. We remember reading in the column of questions and answers in a church magazine, "Do you think people more reverent who bow to the altar as they enter the church?" and the answer was, "When other things are equal, certainly the people who come in and make their bow towards the altar (as officers and men salute the colours) are more reverent than those who come in and look round for their friends and smilingly salute them." It is not a fair comparison, and we have known people before now who saluted both friends and altar, and there are many who do not salute either. We ought not to say that one who makes his obeisance is more reverent than the one who does not.

There is a fine passage in a sermon by a well known preacher which deals with the cleavage between the Puritans and the Ritualists: "The

¹ "Here a more profound inclination of the body will be made," and at the words "O Lord, open Thou our lips, with the thumb on the lips" are illustrations of irritating instructions.

cleavage is temperamental ; and it will exist inevitably to the end. It is a normal division of type, inherent in human nature. The one, in his desire to magnify and intensify the act of God upon his soul, instinctively strips it bare of all envelopment . . . lets it stand out naked and alone, God's own peculiar unique and incomparable deed. . . . So he goes in that mind to the Holy Table and strips his sanctuary bare. And the other, out of his brimming joy, in the triumphant compassion of God in Christ for his pardoned soul, would gather in the whole splendour of the round earth to embody this thoughtfulness and to fulfil His praise. Let the glorious marbles rise tier upon tier ! Let the colours flame ! Let the sweet incense yield its fragrance ! Let music pour its soul abroad in living ecstasy ! Let the wealth of all the world find its highest ministry in declaring the wonder of God's worship and the fulness of His peace ! Well, these two have taken different roads ; they can never meet, but each in his own way is bent on witnessing to one and one only fact—the supreme gift of God to him in the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. They have taken diverse ways to express exactly the same thing, and that is that Christ is all in all, and that He makes Himself ours in this act of holy worship. Ah, how shameless has been our betrayal of this our faith ! We of the Church have gone on insisting on “ one mould, one type, one attitude for all Churchmanship.” ¹ It is wisely said that “ extremists do not make a

¹ Canon Scott Holland.

Church," but they widen the cleavage already existing, and they pass the extreme limits of excess on the one hand and of defect on the other. If there must be various modes of thought there need not be party spirit and self-contained parties sharply divided. Surely unity is necessary in the work of Foreign Missions, but even here we have party societies, and there are few Churches or individuals who contribute to both; while at home the purchase of benefices by party trusts is an unpleasant experience. Until we make a determined effort to eliminate party spirit, the sacred work of the Mother Church of England will be hindered, if not rendered altogether ineffective. Irritating language must be abandoned, and shibboleths must be discouraged. The High Churchman must surrender his use of the word "mass," and the Low Churchman must cease to speak suspiciously of "mass vestments." The former has a special connotation that is now unnecessary, and a special dress for Holy Communion does not denote a special doctrine. We have already dealt with the meaning of "mass"; we need only say in regard to "vestments" that they were, apparently, sanctioned by the Court of Appeal in 1857, and certainly by the Court of Arches in 1870, twice condemned by the Courts of Appeal in 1871 and 1877; but with the light of new and unbiassed evidence it seems generally agreed that they would be sanctioned to-day.¹ The same may be said of

¹ We deal with the Report of the Ritual Commission *re* Vestments later.

the confessional. The High Churchman must cease to insist that it is a compulsory condition of the sacrament of Confirmation and Communion, without any regard to parental or a guardian's wishes and opinions, and the Low Churchman, on his part, has no right to condemn those who are ready to hear the confession of one who "cannot otherwise quieten his conscience," according to the plain direction of the Prayer Book. We must resolve that we will not call the High Churchmen "spikes," or the Low Churchmen "dissenters," or either of them "traitors." Thus, then, we conclude by paying a tribute of respect and honour to the High Churchman who has kept for us the Apostolic Ministry, the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ, and the efficacy of the Sacraments; to the Low Churchman, who has taught us the soul's need of personal contact with the Saviour; and to the Broad Churchman, who has brought the value of the faith into the light of daily life and practice.

The Church Association.

If we are to judge by the "Ritualistic Clergy List," published by the Church Association, there is indeed a serious charge which the Church of England must refute. First, let it be said that the Church Association is not representative of any accredited section of churchmen, High, Low, or Broad, but it has the support of uncompromising Dissenters. Comment is superfluous. The Association

was formed in London in 1865 "to uphold the doctrine, principles, and order of the United Church of England and Ireland," and afterwards "to encourage concerted action for the advancement and progress of spiritual religion." How does it proceed to carry out the intentions of its founders? "During the proceedings against Mr. Enraght, the emissaries of this association bribed a man by the promise of a suit of clothes and a pair of boots to go up to the altar rails of Holy Trinity, Bordesley, for the ostensible purpose of receiving the Holy Communion, in order to secrete and remove the Blessed Sacrament under the form of wafer bread, for the purpose of producing it as evidence against Mr. Enraght in Lord Penzance's Court. This deliberately planned and most blasphemous act of sacrilege was successfully perpetrated." ¹ The Birmingham Branch of the Association passed this resolution: "The Committee repudiate the idea of outrage and blasphemy charged upon the act of securing an illegal wafer for inspection, and regard it rather as one of loyalty to the Church, and patriotism to the State. They rejoice in it and its results." ² For months this consecrated wafer was kept in the Registry of Lord Penzance's Court as an "exhibit," until Archbishop Tait rescued it, and consumed it in his private chapel. This, then, is one of the methods of the Church Association! Its opinions are of a similar standard. They are

¹ Extract from *Church Times*.

² Ibid. October 10, 1879.

disreputable, fanatical, bigoted, and unchristian. They describe clergy as "public violators of their vows" and "ministers of an alien creed," and they assert that "the Church of England is honeycombed by members of secret societies." They urge that "every churchman should steadily refuse to subscribe to any Church work whatever conducted by any of the clergy whose names are to be found in this list." This latter contains the names of more than nine thousand clergy, whose names, in many cases, are among the most honoured and trusted in England. The crime ascribed to a very large number of these clergy is that they use "altar lights" and take the "eastward position." A little information concerning these two customs may be useful and helpful.

"The Eastward Position."

It is not, as some have imagined, turning to the east at the recitation of the Creed, but it is the position taken by the officiating clergyman at the Holy Communion, when, with his back to the people, he faces east. This is denounced as illegal. What law has been broken? Formerly there was a Court of Delegates, in which ecclesiastical matters were decided. This was disbanded in 1832, and its duties were transferred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. In the "Purchas" case (1860-70) the eastward position was declared to be illegal but in the "Ridsdale" judgment (1875-6)

it was decided that the clergyman might stand anywhere for the Consecration Prayer, provided the people could see him perform the manual acts,¹ but he must stand at the north end at the beginning of the service. But whatever the decisions of the Privy Council may be, the clergy are under no bond to obey them. The Ordination Service has not been altered since the Privy Council became a sort of Court of Appeal, and in this service the clergy are pledged to obey, not the Privy Council, but their ordinary, *i.e.* their Bishop.

Does the Prayer Book throw any light and give any guidance upon the question? By implication, yes, in the rubrics or directions. (a) The rubric before the recitation of the commandments directs that "The priest turning *to* the people." This implies that previously he had been turning *from* them, *i.e.* eastwards. (b) The rubric after the commandments says, "The priest standing as before," *i.e.* again eastwards. (c) The rubric after the confession directs that "The Priest . . . turning himself *to* the people," *i.e.* from the eastward position, which is turning from the people. (d) The rubric before "It is very meet, right . . ." says, "Then shall the priest turn to the Lord's Table," *i.e.* eastwards once more. (e) The rubric before the Consecration Prayer directs "The priest standing before the Table . . . before the people." This

¹ *I.e.* "take the paten into his hands"; "break the bread"; "lay his hand upon all the bread"; "take the cup"; "lay his hand on every vessel."

evidently implies "in the name of the people" rather than "that the people may see what he is doing," for the words formerly used here, "in the sight of the people," were rejected in 1662. There is another rubric which is not so easy to obey; it is the last of those at the beginning of the Communion Service. It reads thus: "The priest standing at the north side of the Table." There are two sides and two ends to an oblong table, and while it occupies the place in the church that is now familiar to us, there are north and south ends, and east and west sides, but there is no such thing as a north side. Is there any explanation of this anomaly? The date of the rubric is anterior to Archbishop Laud, in whose time the Holy Table was moved into the nave or body of the church. In the reign of Charles II. the Table was removed into the Chancel or Sanctuary, but the rubric was not altered accordingly. This would appear to be a very satisfactory explanation of the anomaly, for it was then possible to obey the rubric and to face south, and when the Table was once again placed altar ways, the priest would move with it and face east.¹ It may be asked, Why all this fuss about what seems a trifling matter? The Church Association, in the publication already quoted, professes to give the reason. It is "in order to worship the wafer-god of their own making, and to offer a sham sacrifice for sin"! We need not concern ourselves

¹ Mr. Beresford Hope supports this contention, but was answered by Dean Howson in "Before the Table."

with any opinion expressed by this Association. It has been said that "the heart of the whole question is whether the Holy Communion is the offering of a sacrifice or the administration of a sacrament?"¹ May we not say with truth that it is both these? and is it necessary to assert that the eastward position is "one of many adjuncts which all combined have ended in this, that there is in the Holy Communion a Romeward drift?"² Those who adopt the eastward position are bluntly asked, If there is no sacrificial idea, why do you value it? We are inclined to think that so great is the fear of the Roman drift in some minds that even the most natural and innocent actions are suspected. Stripped of suspicion, it is seen that the eastward position is not only allowed by the Privy Council, but it is implied by the rubrics in the Holy Communion Service, and further, it would appear to appeal to the fitness and appropriateness of the service. The Presbyterian divines objected to it at the Savoy Conference, but the Bishops gave as their reason for supporting it that "when the minister speaks to the people, it is convenient that he turn to them, yet when he speaks for them to God, it is fit that they should all turn another way, as the ancient Church ever did." No one will deny that in this service the minister is the mouthpiece and leader of the assembled congregation; he is performing an act on behalf of those present, and

¹ Bishop of Manchester at Annual Meeting, C.P.A.S., October, 1913.

² Ibid.

in their name. Imagine the effect of a deputation to the King in which the spokesman and members assumed different positions! As the Lambeth judgment asserts, the eastward position is both decent and in accord with the mind of the Church. To the plain man, who approaches the question in no controversial mind, this is the natural position to be taken by one who presents a petition, or who represents the petitioners. It is interesting also that it is the position adopted by the National Protestant Churches of Europe, the Lutherans of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. Curiously enough, the position of the Levitical priest is northward, and so they who object to the eastward position, as that of a sacrificing priest, actually identify themselves with him in supporting the northward.¹

We need not be ashamed that in more than one sense there is a sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion. We plead "the oblation of Christ once offered," and there is "the sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies," and there is "our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." Apart from this, cannot those who are afraid of an eastward position see that it is quite possible for a clergyman to consent to take the northward position, and yet to be able to preach an advanced doctrine if he so desires? It seems a pity to stand out for a position which can denote anything or nothing.

¹ Lev. i. 11: "And he shall kill it on the side of the altar northwards,"

Altar Lights.

In the case of *Martin v. Mackonochie* (1867-8), the use of candles for symbolic purposes, *i.e.* when not required for the purpose of giving light, was declared illegal, and the Church Association declares that "their use has never been recognized as legal by the Supreme Court." Now the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has indicated that earlier judgments are by no means final, and are open to review in future cases. This opinion is confirmed by the fact that its decisions have been reversed from time to time. The Church Association says, also, that the Lambeth judgment in the Lincoln case "has no power to override or vary the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Martin v. Mackonochie*." Yet this Supreme Court declared (August 8, 1888) that the Archbishop had jurisdiction to try the case. Accordingly, he delivered the "Lincoln judgment." What was it? The Bishop of Lincoln was charged with, among other things, allowing two candles to be lighted when not necessary to give light. The Archbishop decided that the presence of two candles burning during the service, but lighted before it began, was lawful under the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., and has never been declared unlawful. Moreover, he showed from writings and prints that there had been a continuous use of lights in many cathedrals and in all the chapels royal in Elizabeth's reign, and a use of them in the time of James I. and after

the Restoration, and in the period between 1680 and 1750. He went on to declare that these lights have never been "abused to superstition." If it be true that we appeal to the English cathedrals when we desire to know what is the custom of the Church of England, then there is no question that almost all the cathedrals have lighted candles either at all or at early celebrations of Holy Communion. The promoters of the prosecution appealed to the judicial committee, and the appeal was heard in June and July, 1891, and failed on all points. With regard to lights, the Privy Council held that the Bishop was not responsible for the presence of the lighted candles, therefore the charge against him could not be sustained, and they dismissed it without considering the general question of their lawfulness, and they intimated that had this question been before them it would have been "matter for grave consideration how far the Archbishop's elaborate exposition of its history and the decision of two learned judges in 1628 and 1629 have afforded new materials for consideration since the decision in *Martin v. Mackonochie* upon the same subject." Thus the judicial committee held (a) that the Archbishop had undoubted right to try these questions, and (b) that if they had had to discuss the lawfulness of lights they would have altered the previous verdict.

There is no record of the symbolic use by the early Church of altar lights. They began to be used in the third century in honour of martyrs,

and in connexion with burials. They had originally no special reference to our Saviour's Sacramental Presence in the Holy Communion, and were not limited to this service. There were lights at all the choir offices between A.D. 590 and 1517. What do they signify?

There is a very beautiful significance, to which no reasonable objection can be taken. The two candles were held to signify in the Middle Ages the joy of the two peoples—Jew and Gentile—at the Nativity of Christ, and the cross in the middle symbolized Him who had “broken down the middle wall of partition, so that there is neither Jew nor Greek, but both are one in Christ Jesus.” S. Jerome (fourth century) refers to lights at the reading of the Gospel at the Eucharist. The lights in the daytime may be said to signify that the light of the Church is the light of grace, and not of nature.

In the Injunctions of Edward VI. (1547) there shall be “only two lights upon the altar before the Sacrament . . . for the signification that Christ is the very true Light of the world.” If we say and believe, as we do, that Christ's words, “where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst,” are true of a prayer meeting in a cottage, they are certainly true of the Holy Communion, which is the only gospel service. Lights are also emblems of joy, and appropriate to a service which is sometimes called the Eucharist or thanksgiving, even as the candles on a Christmas tree betoken joy.

Vestments.

These also form the ground of a bitter controversy, and the suggestion that a permissive use may be granted to those who desire to wear them has not lessened the bitterness. Are they really symbolic of Roman or of any doctrine? Can history enlighten us? They were prescribed by authority in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., and the Prayer Book of Elizabeth, and by men who were perfectly familiar with their use in the reigns of Henry and Mary. Would they have been so prescribed if they were in the least degree significant of Roman doctrine? This, at any rate, is the testimony of the Ritual Commission, which states clearly in its report¹ that "it is not open to question that the Eucharistic vestments were retained in the Church of England after the repudiation of the Roman doctrine and the substitution of the Prayer Book for the Roman service." This report also expresses the opinion that "the use of a special dress for the Holy Communion does not necessarily involve the acceptance of the Roman doctrine as to the nature of that service," and many connect their use with the doctrine of a commemorative sacrifice; but, as the same report points out, the Eucharistic vestments were in use some centuries before 1215, at which date the doctrine of transubstantiation was first defined. There are others, however, who believe that vestments symbolize

¹ S.P.C.K. 1s. net.

a propitiatory sacrifice, and for this reason desire to prevent the restoration of their use. Not a few people vehemently disapprove of the use even of a coloured stole, or of altar frontals in colours according to the Church's season; yet these same people clothe their bodies in accordance with time and occasion—black for funerals, white for wedding and other festivals. To a mind free from dread and suspicion of Romanism, a sombre colour for the warning season of Lent, a joyful one for Easter and Christmas, would seem in accord not only with ancient practice, but with modern common sense. It is possible that if every clergyman agreed to wear a chasuble there would be no feeling about any doctrine specially attached thereto. We have seen a remarkable change in the attitude of people towards a surplice, to which violent objection was formerly taken, but which is now accepted almost everywhere.

The Ornaments Rubric.

Both High and Low Churchmen seem reluctant to have a clear and definite explanation of the Ornaments Rubric, preferring that each may claim it for his own particular view, but there are many who would welcome an authoritative statement by experts that they may know exactly "where they are." Until it is provided, it seems no one has a right to call another lawless. It cannot be denied that there are clergymen of the Church of England

who hold extreme views, and the law is broken by many irregular practices, but the offenders nevertheless can claim in some cases that these practices date from ancient times, before the introduction of Roman abuses. What is now wanted is sufficient elasticity, without straining the rubrics, a careful and expert revision of the laws of public worship, with a power of enforcing its observation in ecclesiastical courts. We might then witness an end to unproved charges of disobedience on the part of a few, which is a cause of weakness and scandal, and an offence against public order. There are many, now dissatisfied because uncertain, who desire to be loyal, and would gladly obey the Church, which can speak with no uncertain voice. They do not care to pretend contentment with a rubric which is understood by one party to require and by another to prohibit the use of vestments. They consider it humiliating and morally injurious.

The Ritual Commission's Opinion.

When we turn to the findings of the Ritual Commission we notice that the committee regard vestments as a valuable proof of the continuity and unity of the Church. They entered upon their work as enquirers, not as controversialists, and they sought to "produce a record which would bear the test of severe criticism, and be a sound basis for future action." The first chapter of the report sketches the origin of liturgical costume in the

secular and official dress of the Roman Empire, shows that there was no imitation of Levitical usage in the choice of garments adopted for Church use, and no intentional symbolism. Their general conclusion is that vestments have never been abolished in principle, and their retention or abolition ought not to be a matter of controversy. They were used by Luther and all his early followers, and are still in use in the Protestant kingdom of Sweden. The opinions of the individual members of the committee who presented the report to the Upper House of Convocation in February, 1908, are interesting. The chairman (Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury) said: "We have throughout borne in mind that our work was to be historical. We were not advocates, but enquirers." The Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Robertson) said: "Matters of ecclesiastical ornaments and dress were to him matters of the most complete indifference, but it seemed to him a matter of very great importance that the minister should represent and embody the authority of the Church. In an army the merits or demerits of a particular type of uniform were of no importance at all, but the question which was important was whether that particular kind of uniform was or was not according to regulations." The Bishop of Ely (Dr. Chase) "approached the investigation with an absolutely open mind." The Bishop of Bristol (Dr. Forrest Browne) endorsed the Archbishop of Canterbury's statement "that the report and discussion in the House had

nothing whatever to do with the pronouncement of any policy." The report was sent to the Upper House of the Convocation of York. There the Bishop of Sodor and Man (Dr. Drury) pleaded for "a careful consideration of it from all parties." The Church newspapers are equally interesting. The *Guardian* called the report "the most valuable document bearing upon the vestiarian controversy that has been published in our time," and proceeded to say that "those who denounce it will but indicate that they care nothing for facts." It has been suggested that a declaratory rubric, similar to the one which explains "kneeling reception," would conciliate much Protestant opinion, and the author of the suggestion thinks it should read as follows: "Lest any should misconstrue the Church's retention of the vestments under this rubric, so that her doctrine as it is set forth in her formularies suffer hurt, it is declared that the Church doth retain them for that reason which was set forth in the preface 'of ceremonies,' that is to say, for their antiquity, and that she does not deem them and hath never deemed them 'to set forth any doctrine of the Supper of the Lord.'"¹

Perhaps High Churchmen would refuse to subscribe to this, for when Lord Halifax was asked by the Rev. J. E. Watts Ditchfield whether he would agree to a permissive use of the vestments with such a rubric, the answer was, "I do not think it possible to maintain that the use of vestments

¹ Rev. H. A. Bardsley, *Guardian*, February 12, 1908.

has no doctrinal significance." Prebendary Webb Peploe gave it as his opinion that "a deeper study of the report brings one to the conclusion that they had a bias necessarily from the commencement."¹ The report concludes with a tribute to the loyalty of the clergy in general, which will allay or banish the fears of the suspicious. It says: "The complaints made to us (of alleged breaches or neglect of the law) relate to a small proportion of the 14,242 churches in England and Wales, and vary greatly in their character and gravity. To preclude an impression which would, we believe, be unjust to the general body of the clergy, we desire to place on record our conviction that the evidence gives no justification for any doubt that in the large majority of parishes the work of the Church is being quietly and diligently performed by clergy who are entirely loyal to the principles of the English Reformation as expressed in the Book of Common Prayer."

¹ London Diocesan Conference. See *Church Times*, May 22, 1908.

CHAPTER V.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AS BY LAW ESTABLISHED ;
THE ORIGIN OF ENDOWMENT AND OF TITHE.

The Church in Britain.

WHEN was Christianity first proclaimed in Britain? This is a question which "it is not possible to answer."¹ As Professor Fuller said, "The light of the world shined here, but we see not who kindled it." We are as ignorant of the place as we are of the date, but we know from ancient records that there was a church at Glastonbury in the very early times, and probably before A.D. 300. We have historical evidence of a British Church, in the fact that Bishops were present at the Councils of Arles in A.D. 314, of Nicæa in A.D. 325, and of Ariminum in A.D. 359. There are remains of very ancient churches at Lyminge, Reculver, Richborough, Dover, and other places. We read in history that the Romans were summoned from Britain in A.D. 410 to defend Italy against the Goths. The invasion of the Saxons took place in A.D. 449. When they landed at Ebbsfleet, near

¹ Professor Bright, "Early Church History."

Pegwell Bay, these heathen invaders destroyed Christians and their altars wherever they were to be found, and if some of the Christians had not fled into Wales Christianity might have been exterminated from these islands.

Every one is familiar with a great event in Church history—the coming of Augustine. He and his companions landed in Kent in A.D. 597. The story is well known. Gregory the Great, afterwards Bishop of Rome, saw in the market-place some boys for sale. They were “of white body, fair complexion, and with hair of remarkable beauty.” “Where do they come from?” he asked. “From Britain,” was the answer. “Are they heathen or Christian?” “Heathen.” “What is their nation?” “They are Angles.” “’Tis well, they have the face of an angel,” was Gregory’s comment. “What is their province?” “Deira.” “They must be saved ‘from the anger of God.’” (*De ira Dei*). Some years passed, and in A.D. 596 he determined upon a mission to Britain. The term “England” was unknown, of course, at this date. Ethelbert, the ruler of Kent, which was one of the seven kingdoms, had married a Christian. Through her influence he was persuaded to meet Augustine, who approached carrying a silver cross, and was followed by a procession of singers, with a banner at their head. The King gave him permission to evangelize, and became a convert, and was baptized. He it was that laid the foundations of Canterbury Cathedral. Augustine was consecrated the first

Archbishop. He next founded a church at Rochester, the foundations of which were discovered in 1890, when the west front was underpinned. The Bishopric of Rochester, second in antiquity to Canterbury, dates from A.D. 604. Augustine then turned his attentions to London, and built a church that same year near the site of St. Paul's Cathedral.

We do not owe the conversion of England entirely or originally to Rome. We have noted there was already a British Church before Gregory despatched Augustine to these shores. Missionaries came from Ireland, Scotland, and other places to convert the north and midlands, for "a very large portion of England was converted from the north."¹

An Act of Parliament Church.

We are sometimes told that the Church of England is an Act of Parliament Church. We must ask those who say so to produce proofs, and to give the date of such Act, for it must be upon the Statute Book, on which are entered all Bills that have been passed into law. This they cannot do, but those who persist in calling ours a Parliamentary Church dislodged from this argument, take refuge behind some words which need some explanation.

As by Law Established.

They are "the Church of England as by law established." We have said there is no Act of

¹ Mr. Gladstone, House of Commons, May 24, 1870.

Parliament which created the Church, and we also say there is none that established it. It is impossible that the Church of England can have been established by Act of Parliament, for the obvious reason that the Church existed before Parliament. Archbishop Theodore (A.D. 668-690) consolidated the various missions into one great ecclesiastical organization, and thus the Church of England became the National Church, as distinct from a Church of Mercia, Northumbria, Kent, etc. This Archbishop presided at the Synod held at Hertford in 673. There was as yet no English nation. Britain was a heptarchy, and each of the seven kingdoms or provinces had its own ruler, until the accession of Egbert, in 822; and even then the nation was scarcely established till Athelstan's reign in 925. There was no Parliament for national legislation till 1265, and even then it met in the Chapter House of Westminster Abbey for 350 years. Thus it is true to say that the National Synods of the Church of England gave to the nation the idea of a National Parliament, and the canons passed in those synods were the origin of our statute law.¹ Parliament in its infancy found the Church the greatest fact in national life, and it would have been strange indeed if Parliament had not protected and sanctioned it as time went on. But whence came the phrase "as by law established"? This now familiar term is very misleading, for it causes many to suppose that on a certain date the State set up

¹ Green, "History of the English People," I. p. 59.

the Church. In order the better to understand the term it should be remembered that it bears a different meaning at different periods of history. The word "established" in connexion with the Church is of comparatively recent origin, for it appears for the first time in an Act of Parliament in the reign of Edward VI., but on this occasion it referred, not to the Church, but to the revised Prayer Book. The Proclamation of the changes to be made in the public services of the Church on the King's accession opens with the words, "Whereas by the Act of Uniformity which establishes the Liturgy." The word "established" means "placed upon a secure foundation," if we refer to the use of it in the Prayer for Parliament, in which we pray that "peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us for all generations." The first of the Canons of 1603 states that "all usurped and foreign power, forasmuch as the same hath no establishment nor ground in the law of God, is abolished." In 1665 it meant that every Englishman was required by law to conform to the Church, and conformity established by law was enforced by penalties. Thus "establishment" attained its fullest expression in the Middle Ages. The Reformation made no change in this conception of the term. Compulsion still remained though the Church's legislative and judicial functions were curtailed. Broadly speaking, it means that relationship between Church and State by

which the Church is the official organ of the national religion.

Establishment Benefits the State not the Church.

It is generally thought that those who maintain the establishment desire it in the interests of the Church, to safeguard the privileges and advantages. This is not so. There is only one reason for upholding the doctrine of establishment. It is for the sake of the State. As a Church we have practically nothing to lose and everything to gain. For what they are worth, the establishment confers two advantages, which disestablishment would remove. They are (a) a national recognition of religion, and (b) the parochial system. Upholders of the establishment maintain that the nation must have the religious basis of a corporate life, by which it acknowledges God, apart from the religious convictions of individual citizens. Some go even further and say that the nation can only acknowledge and worship God through an established Church, but this is to maintain too much, for the State is made up of individuals, and it is individual convictions that influence the State. Some make it a great point that a State should be officially religious, but it is, of course, quite possible for a State to be unofficially religious, and it is not necessarily true to say that the Church cannot do its work in and for the State unless she is officially recognized as its religious organ. Disestablishment, therefore, does not necessarily mean

the removal of a great public witness that God is the supreme Head of the nation. Some will point to the great traditions of the past, and to the hold the Church has had upon the life and affection of the nation, and their contention may be thus summarized: "Society in this country would lose enormously by the disestablishment of an old, historical, and national Church." Mr. Gladstone said much the same when he used these words: "The Church of England has not only been a part of the history of this country, but a part so vital, entering so profoundly into the entire life and action of the country, that the severing of the two would leave nothing behind but a bleeding and lacerating mass. Take the Church of England out of the history of England, and the history of England becomes a chaos, without order, without life, and without meaning."¹ The Bishop of Liverpool, speaking of the Church's influence on national character, said: "She brings all the great crises of our national life into contact with God and with the eternal. Through her the nation, as a nation, offers up its confession of sin, its pleading for help, its praises and thanksgiving, for material mercies, and consecrates by prayer national and municipal enterprise."² In the same speech the Bishop said that "the recent Coronation service had brought home to us the true and lofty conception of kingship as a divine office."

¹ House of Commons, May 16, 1873.

² Church Congress, 1904.

A Jarring Note on Public Occasions.

Is it possible to refute the sentiment that in times of national mourning or rejoicing, and on occasions of great ceremonies, it would be inconceivable that there should be no national Church to interpret and sanctify them? Yes, it is. Take the Coronation by way of illustration. For the King and Queen, for the representatives of the Church, and for some others, there was, no doubt, a full realization of the religious solemnity of the proceedings. But was there nothing to jar upon the feelings of religious-minded people outside in the knowledge that the noble Abbey was turned into a series of grand-stands, from which the spectacle was viewed? Were there no craning necks, no picnic lunches, no worldly and frivolous conversations? I make bold to say that in the churches and chapels of the land there was a greater unanimity of thought and feeling best befitting the sacred place of the Most High. Or, again, those who attended the memorial services for the passing of the King could not fail to be impressed by the quiet devotion of the people in the humblest edifice. An established Church was not necessary to ensure this.

When we consider the parochial system we realize that every man, woman, and child, in overcrowded town or scattered village, belongs to some parish, in which there is one man whose ministerial services each claims as a right by day or night. It should

be a blessing that in every place there lives a minister of religion, and only a national Church now provides this. But the time may not be far distant when the Dissenters will map out their districts into "parishes" and provide a minister for each.

The Privileges of the National Church.

A word is necessary concerning the privileges enjoyed by the national Church. They are not now so great or so many as formerly. Many have been taken away which were, perhaps, natural at a time when all were churchmen, but few can contemplate with pleasure the idea of a conformity which was enforced by rigorous penalties, as was the case in 1665, when every one absent from divine service on Sunday was liable to a shilling fine, and anyone that dared to speak against the Prayer Book was condemned to imprisonment, and Dissenters who ventured to assemble for family worship with more than four outsiders present were fiercely dealt with. Dissenters since then have fought for and gradually gained equal rights in most particulars, and they will not rest satisfied, and we cannot blame them, till they have wrested the last strongholds of privilege from churchmen. The University of Oxford will not be able to stand out much longer on the matter of limiting divinity degrees to those who are in Holy Orders in the Church of England. The motion for the rejection of the statute was only defeated by "non-residents

whipped up to vote down this simple measure of decency and justice."

The few remaining privileges of the "establishment" are chiefly these: (*a*) the King is crowned according to the rites of the Church, and is bound to be a communicant. It is conceivable that there might be a coronation as a religious ceremony, in which all denominations had a part. This was the case—was it not?—at the investiture of the Prince of Wales. (*b*) Some of the Bishops have seats in the House of Lords; but too much stress need not be laid upon this fact, for dissenting ministers may and Anglican clergy cannot sit in the House of Commons. If, therefore, it be argued that Bishops should give their full time to their spiritual duties, which should leave none for politics, the same argument must be used of dissenting ministers. There is at any rate one advantage not generally noted in the fact that Bishops sit in the House of Lords. At any rate they are not there by hereditary right! Is it altogether impracticable that, in the future, room may be found in an Upper Chamber for the leaders of all religious denominations? When it is said that Bishops are all upholders of one particular party in politics, the statement can truthfully be denied, but it is doubtful whether a similar statement regarding the dissenting ministers in the House of Commons can be denied. (*c*) Church of England chaplains are provided for the Court, the Army and Navy, and the Civil Service departments, but already to some extent this privilege

is being now shared by the ministers of non-established denominations.

Her Disabilities.

On the other side, the "Church of England as by law established" suffers from considerable disability compared, for instance, with the Established Church of Scotland, in that the price she must pay for the establishment is that Parliament, composed of all religions and of none, which includes Jews, Roman Catholics, Dissenters, and Agnostics, is able to interfere with matters affecting the Church of which many are profoundly ignorant, and some are incompetent or unworthy to discuss. The Church cannot alter the Prayer Book, reform convocation, increase the number of bishoprics, or deal with the laws that govern the appointment or retirement of incumbents, or the question of dilapidations without the consent of Parliament. The acceptance of parliamentary modification of the Church's laws is really a surrender of her ancient constitutional liberties. Queen Elizabeth decreed that "Her Highness's pleasure is that no Bills concerning religion shall be preferred or received into this House, unless the same shall first be considered and liked by the clergy"; and it was she who secured the insertion in Article 20 of the words "the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith." No doubt in Anglo-Saxon days, King, Witan, and

clergy acted jointly, but the body politic was then a united catholic society.

If, then, we must confess that our hands are tied by Parliament, let us be quite clear that the Church does not take her doctrines and worship from Parliament. Three documents deal with our doctrines and worship—the Prayer Book, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Canons of 1603. Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles was made a condition of Ordination and Institution by the Convocation of 1571. The Church can repeal this to-morrow without any recourse to Parliament. Parliament accepted the Prayer Book from the Spirituality without discussion in 1662.

An Intolerable Position.

The present position is intolerable. Sooner or later the Church must, and will, demand some measure of autonomy either with or without establishment. The relations between Church and State were settled in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in an arbitrary and unconsidered way, and without regard for principle, for political necessities demanded a settlement. The result has been confusion and inconvenience, against which "the instincts of self-development in a living society naturally chafe."

The "Freedom" of the Free Churches.

It is necessary to point out that, to use a paradox, the Free Churches are not free, for it is commonly

thought that the Church is entirely in the hands of Parliament, and Dissent is not. Dissenters are also under the control of the State. The Wesleyan ministers who move from place to place every three years are bound so to do by Wesley's Deed Poll, and to be rid of this necessity they must apply to Parliament for an extension of the period. In 1905 the National Free Church Council resolved that "in the opinion of this Council it is desirable that an Act of Parliament should be obtained to enable the Free Churches of England and Wales, whether grouped connexionally or as separate Churches, to vary, repeat, or unmake . . . the trusts, so far as they affect doctrine and polity, under which their property is held." Thus the State exercises control over Free churchmen with regard to property, even though they are not compelled to conform to State standards of belief and worship, or to admit to communion those whom the State may consider fit to be admitted. They can appoint their own ministers, alter their administrative areas, and hold conferences without any outside interference. But though they may not be compelled to conform to State standards, the State *can* compel them to conform to their own trust deeds in regard to doctrine. In 1881 the Chancery Division of the High Court found that a Mr. Stannard, Minister of an Independent Chapel at Huddersfield, preaching against eternal punishment, had not preached the doctrine laid down in the trust deed, and he, and the officers and members agreeing with him, were expelled from

the chapel. Commenting upon this case, the *Christian World* said, "As matters now stand, hundreds of Congregational ministers might be ejected from their pulpits and livings by trustees appealing to Chancery to enforce the preaching of certain antiquated and now unbelievable doctrines of their trust deeds."¹ The *Nonconformist* said, "Let us for very shame have done with the lofty superiority which we are so fond of assuming with regard to creed-bound Christians. We are ourselves more miserably bound than any of them."² The *Christian Commonwealth* said, "Most (Congregational) chapels are held by trust deeds which incorporate nearly all the religious errors of which we complain. . . . We unhesitatingly assert that Congregationalists are not independent, and that their claim to be so in an eminent degree is sheer arrogance."

It is quite a mistake to suppose that the so-called "Free Churches" have freedom apart from Parliament. The fifty-fourth report of the Charity Commissioners throws a powerful light upon Dr. Clifford's statement that "Free Churches exult in the freedom of their churches from Parliamentary control." During the preceding year these Commissioners approved and certified schemes with reference to the property of three chapels, "requiring in each case an Act of Parliament to give effect to them." The Commissioners say that "the main object of the scheme in each case is to authorize

¹ February 24, 1881.

² March 24 1881.

a variation in the doctrinal trusts upon which the chapel is settled, so as to bring them into accordance with the doctrines generally held at the present time by the congregation or denomination to which the chapel belongs." The minister is legally bound to hold and preach the doctrines as set out in the trust deed, unless Parliament intervenes. It was an Act of Parliament which in 1898 permitted marriages to be solemnized without the presence of the Registrar in Dissenting chapels. In a case at the courts ¹ the defendant acknowledged that his teaching was inconsistent with the trust deed, but he was unwilling to continue his ministry if in the opinion of the court he was required to teach the obsolete doctrines of Calvinism. The judge advised that the chapel be closed pending the trial of the action, on the ground that the provisions of the trust deed were still binding on the trustees. Thus this "Free Church" was not exempt from State control. The possession of property demands State law.

A Scandalous Defect.

There was a case in the courts recently ² in which it was decided that the Bishop had no discretionary right or power to enquire into the character or conduct of the person he admits to the office of churchwarden. Had he possessed this power, the court

¹ *Halmshaw v. Jones*, before Mr. Justice Joyce.

² *The King v. The Bishop of Salisbury*.

acknowledged that he would have acted reasonably in refusing to admit a certain person. This decision was based on the principle that the Bishop, in admitting a churchwarden, acts ministerially or mechanically. Presumably every religious denomination except the Church of England can enquire into the conduct of its officials. It is quite time this defect were remedied, and that a Bishop should have sufficient discretionary power, at least, to prevent a gross misuse of powers exercised by electors to the office of churchwarden. Apart from this it is regrettable that the laity should have made such a case possible.

Precedents for Self-government.

Parliament has already created more than one precedent in favour of the self-government of the Church. In 1905 it conferred a new power upon the Established Church of Scotland, and in 1907 it gave legal establishment to a new dissenting denomination, when the United Methodist Church Act enabled the United Methodist Free Churches, the Methodist New Connexion, and the Bible Christians to form themselves into a new body, and transferred to it the funds and properties belonging respectively to the three several denominations. The Act gave this Body freedom to state the doctrines of the Deed Poll in whatever terms it pleased. In a sense it becomes "an Established Church," and it has freedom. This is a good precedent for us.

The Established Church of Scotland,¹ with its general assembly as its supreme ecclesiastical court, has complete freedom to manage its own affairs. Thus establishment and self-government are not incompatible. It is maintained that liberty should be conceded to the Church of England to the same degree. The Articles of the Established Church of Scotland boldly declare that "Recognition by civil authority of its separate and independent government and jurisdiction, in matters spiritual, in whatever manner such recognition be expressed, does not in any way affect the character of this government and jurisdiction as derived from the Divine Head of the Church alone, and not from any civil authority, or give to the civil authority any right of interference with the proceedings or judgments of the Church within the sphere of its spiritual government and jurisdiction";² and again, "The Church has the inherent right, free from interference by civil authority, but under the safeguards for deliberate action and legislation provided by the Church itself, to declare the sense in which it understands its confession of faith, to modify the forms of expression therein, or to formulate other doctrinal statements, and to define the relation thereto of its office-bearers and members, but always in agreement with the Word of God, and the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith contained

¹ See "Establishment and Freedom," by Canon Masterman. S.P.C.K.—Church Self-government Papers, No. 1.

² Article 5.

in the said confession, of which agreement the Church shall be sole judge, and with due regard to liberty of opinion in points which do not enter into the substance of the Faith." ¹ The Archbishops' Committee on "the relations between Church and State" declare that "the breadth, completeness, and uncompromising character of this declaration make it one of the most remarkable expositions in modern times of the meaning of spiritual independence"; and it is small wonder that the Committee invite the Church of England to claim self-government, for this precedent clearly proves that "subordination to State control is not necessarily involved in the establishment."

No Act of Parliament was needed for the abolition of procurations or for the reduction of the fees for institutions, and none should be needed for such a domestic concern as dilapidations. As an archdeaconry can be created by an Order in Council, it ought to be possible to create a diocese without an Act of Parliament.

In the meantime the Church of England must have a truly representative body with a claim to legislate for the whole Church. As Archbishop Temple said: "In some way or other a national council should be formed which should represent the Church of England as a whole in this island." ² Convocation does not as yet represent the clergy, and the Representative Church Council does not represent either the clergy or the laity.

¹ Article 6.

² Convocation, February 16, 1886.

A Sign of the State's Desire.

The issue by the Crown of Letters of Business to ¹ the Convocations seems to point to the desire of the State to give some power of legislation to the Church. The right of legislation has been already too long delayed. So long ago as 1852 it was said that "the time has come to use all lawful opportunity to obtain from the civil power the liberty to attempt, after due deliberation in Synod, to give greater efficiency to the spiritual ministrations of the Church, to develop her resources, and to secure her internal discipline, to accommodate her dioceses, parishes, ministry, and public offices to the increased numbers and various habits of the population of the empire at home and abroad." ² Parliament cannot be, and does not pretend to be, suitable to legislate for the Church, but the Church needs the driving power of public opinion.

The Church and State Report.

The report of the Archbishops' Committee, already referred to, states that two broad facts must be reckoned with: (1) that Parliament has confined the Church, in every department of its constitutional existence, within statutory bars

¹ That you do debate, consider, consult, and agree upon the following points matters, and things. . . . and after mature debate, consideration, consultation, and agreement, that you do present to US a Report or Reports thereon in writing. See Report of Committee, S.P.C.K. 1s.

² Report of Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, 1852.

which Parliament alone can break or reshape; and (2) that Parliament is no longer fitted to legislate for the Church, since it does not consist exclusively of churchmen, and cannot therefore be considered qualified to speak in the name of the Church. By successive Toleration Acts, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the claims of men who were not churchmen were rightly conceded, and they were able to enter Parliament, but they would not claim to be representative of the Church of England.

Parliament and Church Legislation.

It is true that some Acts of Parliament dealing with matters ecclesiastical have been passed, but Viscount Wolmer has recently pointed out ¹ that "the number of Ecclesiastical Bills which have been repeatedly introduced and 'dropped' without receiving proper discussion, or any discussion at all, is out of all proportion to the amount of legislation that has been effected." He gives details of subjects for which the House has been unable to find time for consideration since 1880. No less than twenty-two Bills have been introduced to remedy the scandal of the sale of benefices, twenty-one of which were dropped, and the only one that was passed ² owed its success to "government time." Forty Bills concerning new bishoprics, and suffragan

¹ The failure of the House of Commons in Ecclesiastical Legislation.—Church Self-government Papers, No. 10.

² The Benefices Act, 1898, which has not, however, succeeded in abolishing Simony.

bishoprics have been introduced, of which only ten were passed, and thirty were dropped, although eighteen of these had passed the House of Lords. In the case of the Diocese of Southwark Bill, five Bills were introduced before it could be passed, although the proposal had received the support of every school of churchmen, High, Low, or Broad, and the requisite money had been found. The Bill was blocked again and again by a few cranks who argued a side issue. The Bishopric of Sheffield Bill was introduced four times. The Bishop of S. Albans told his greater chapter that the only obstacle to the passing of the "Bishoprics Enabling Bill" as an unopposed measure was the opposition of the four Conservative members for Liverpool. Or again, Mr. Asquith refused to sanction the request of the Bishop of Liverpool for a Suffragan Bishopric, because Liverpool Diocese only contains 224 parishes. The Bishop's request should have been complied with, for he knows the needs best. Sometimes opposition comes from strange quarters. The protest against the formation of a Diocese of Buckingham was signed by thirty local gentlemen. Fifteen of the signatories were patrons of "starvation" benefices. Men who do not provide a living wage for the educated gentlemen who minister in these parishes have no right to dictate, still less to block, proposals which are for the benefit of the Church. How can a Bishop be a "Father-in-God" in a diocese like Norwich, with its 900 parishes, or Oxford with 650, or S. Albans with 630? The

Church must not rest content till she has claimed and gained the right to decide when and where new dioceses shall be constituted.

A Remarkable Bill.

Most of the desired Church legislation is of a non-contentious nature, and this emphasizes the unfitness of Parliament to deal with Church matters, and the absurdity of the situation is best manifested by the attempt to introduce a remarkable Bill,¹ the objects of which were a declaration of Protestantism to be made by all bishops and clergy, the abolition as regards persons above the age of eighteen of the condition of admission to Holy Communion, that the communicant must either have been confirmed or be desirous to be confirmed; the Bill further provided that dissenting ministers should preach or minister in cathedrals and churches of the Church of England; that it should be illegal for the clergyman to refuse to admit to Holy Communion a man who has contracted a marriage with his deceased wife's sister, or a woman who has married her deceased sister's husband. It also enacted that the use of the Athanasian Creed should be optional, and authorized the use of the Burial Service for those dying unbaptized and for suicides if the clergyman desires to use it. Thus it appears that while Parliament has little time to devote to practical and non-contentious measures, it might

¹ The Ecclesiastical Law Amendment Bill, introduced by Sir Brynmor Jones,

not use such opportunities as it desires in the direction the Church desires. This is another reason for pressing the demand for self-government. As the Bishop of Oxford has succinctly said: "Looking at the matter solely from the side of expediency, we are driven to the conclusion that the Church grievously needs to be reformed, and there is no body qualified to do it except the Church itself";¹ and he adds that it is at least as easy to propound the same argument from the side of principle.

If it is impossible, although it ought not to be, to gain autonomy except at the price of establishment, then in the interests of the Church we must be prepared to pay it.

Is the Church Property National Property?

Because the Church of England is "by law established," there are some who say and think that the churches and other buildings, are national property, and that the clergy are State paid.' It is astonishing what a large number of people honestly believe that the clergy are paid out of the taxes. Perhaps they have been misled by an item in the Government Blue Books which deals with "the salaries of His Majesty's Ministers"!

Fortunately, it is not difficult to contradict any statement that the clergy are so paid, because the Annual Budget gives the various items of expenditure, and the stipends of the clergy are not among

¹ Dr. Gore, "Self-government for the Church,"—Church Self-government Papers, No. 2. S.P.C.K.

them. Politicians will prefer a politician's statement. Here it is: "With the exception of those in the direct employment of the State as chaplains, the stipends of clergymen of the Church of England are not paid out of the public funds." ¹ How then are they paid? Partly by endowments left and provided by pious ancestors, and partly by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and by the Governors of Queen Ann's Bounty.

Does it really belong to the Roman Church?

It is sometimes asked whether the Church of England is or is not enjoying property which was given to another Church. Opinions for and against can be quoted, but as a rule most reliance can be placed on unprejudiced evidence. Against us, Bishop Welldon, Dean of Manchester, says distinctly that "At the Reformation the State, or the Crown acting on behalf of the State, took away large funds from the Church of Rome, and transferred them to the Church of England, or, to put the case more accurately, took them away from a Church in communion with the See of Rome, and transferred them to a Church not in communion with the See of Rome." ² The latter half of this sentence is certainly "put more accurately," and, as it stands, does not really controvert what has already been said of the identity of the Church before and after the Reformation by Professor Freeman. The

¹ Mr. Lloyd George in letter dated December 8, 1908.

² Disestablishment and Disendowment.

latter authority helps us to the solution of the question when he states, "There was no moment when the State took the Church property from one religious body and gave it to another; that which many people fancy took place under Henry VIII. or Elizabeth simply never happened at all. Not a stone of the then existing ecclesiastical organization in England—the monasteries being only excrescences upon it—was displaced or disturbed."

In corroboration of this Lord Selborne says: "Not one ecclesiastical corporation, except the monasteries, no archbishopric or bishopric, no parochial rectory or vicarage ever was dissolved, none except certain conventual chapels in cathedrals and a few collegiate churches were so much even as remodelled. All their churches were chartered, all their customary rights and incidents by the common law remained in force without interruption; their endowments were held as before by the old tenures and titles."¹

There is silent but valuable witness to the same effect accessible in the many churchwardens' accounts handed down through the centuries. Many of these are, of course, anterior to the Reformation, and show that at no time was there any violent break; the same officers were selected by the vestries, and they kept their accounts in the same books. The lesson of the old vestry books, therefore, is the life of continuity. To give just

¹ "Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment."

one example, King Ethelbert in A.D. 609 presented the Manor of Tillingham, in Essex, to the Dean and Chapter of S. Paul's, for the maintenance of the fabric of that cathedral, and that benefaction has been continuously used for more than 1,300 years.

If it be objected that much property was left to the Church for "masses for the dead," it rests with those who say so to prove that the Church now holds any specific property that was given on such a condition.

What the Romanists Say.

In this connexion, too, it is not without interest to quote a statement issued by the Roman Catholics in A.D. 1826: "British Catholics are charged with entertaining a pretended right to the property of the Established Church in England. We consider such a charge to be totally without foundation; we declare that we entertain no pretension to such a claim. We regard all the revenues and temporalities of the Church Establishment as the property of those on whom they are settled by the laws of the land. We disclaim any right, title, or pretension with regard to the same."¹

The Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

The Commission was constituted a perpetual Corporation in 1836, for the purpose of carrying out

¹ Quoted by Dr. Forrest Browne (then Bishop of Bristol) at the Church Congress.

the recommendations of Commissioners appointed the previous year with a view to the removal of anomalies, and to the better administration of the revenues of the Church. The benefices of the parochial clergy did not come within the scope of the Commissioners' operations, except so far as they needed subdivision or augmentation. The bishoprics varied considerably in area and in wealth. Deans and Chapters, too, varied in their circumstances. Some cathedrals had a dozen canonries, others a less number, whilst S. Paul's possessed only three and Llandaff none. Some of the anomalies will excite the surprise of those who are unaware of them. For instance, the Bishop of Llandaff derived his income from the Deanery of S. Paul's, which he held jointly with his See. The Bishop of Oxford was Dean of Canterbury, and the Bishop of Exeter was a Canon of Durham. A fixed income was assigned to each See, and the Episcopal Estates were handed over to be administered by the Commission. Each chapter had the option of handing over its estates to the Commission or of continuing to administer them. Some sixty-five canonries were suspended, and about sixty sinecure rectories were suppressed as they fell vacant. The revenues thus accruing were formed into a common fund. Episcopal incomes and those of the capitular bodies were and are the first charge upon the income of the Commission, and the surplus is available for the general purposes of the Church, namely, for the maintenance of beneficed and unbeneficed clergy

and for the erection of churches and parsonage houses.¹ The Commissioners have rendered a service to the Church which is marvellous and inspiring. In seventy-six years, *i.e.* since 1840, they have endowed and augmented over eight thousand benefices, and increased provision for the cure of souls exceeds in value £1,378,000 per annum.²

Queen Ann's Bounty.

Before the Reformation the Pope used to demand annates or first fruits and tenths from the bishops and richer clergy. When the power of the Pope was repudiated, King Henry VIII. and successive sovereigns appropriated them to their own personal use, but Queen Ann restored them to the Church under the name of "Queen Ann's Bounty" in 1704. It is estimated that the total amount alienated from the Church between the Reformation and this Queen's reign is more than £2,400,000. Parliament made grants to the Bounty between 1809 and 1820, amounting in all to £1,100,000, but this was really a restoration of alienated funds. The Governors of the Bounty make grants for the increased endowment of poor benefices and for other purposes. Parliament also granted a sum of £216,660 to English Dissenters in the form of a *Regium Donum* between the years 1722 and 1850, and grants to Protestant Dissenters in Ireland, between 1690 and 1885,

¹ See leading Article, *Church Family Newspaper*, March 17, 1905.

² See sixty-ninth Report, for details of a year's work.

amounting to £2,672,783.¹ There are certain churches which might in a sense be called the property of the nation. These are "the million churches," built out of a grant of a million pounds voted in 1818 by the House of Commons as a thank-offering for peace, and to which a further half-million was added in 1824, but even these sums might be regarded as a repayment of money previously alienated.

Tithes.

The origin of tithes is lost in obscurity. At the first it was a voluntary gift of lands or produce, and later of money. Tithes are as old as the Bible. Abraham paid them to Melchizedek.² The Prophet Malachi declared that the people robbed God by withholding tithes and offerings, and he urged them to bring their tithes into the storehouse.³ The Pharisees gave tithes. The system was early introduced into the Christian Church, for Augustine of Hippo (A.D. 354-430) said, "Let us give some part," and in answer to the question "What part?" said "A tithe." They were enjoined by an Archbishop of York in A.D. 740, *i.e.* five hundred years before the existence of Parliament. Thus it is quite wrong and unhistorical to say that Parliament created the tithes.

For a time these voluntary offerings sufficed, but

¹ Earl of Selborne, "Defence of the Church of England," fourth edition, pp., 212, 217.

² Gen. xiv. 20.

³ Mal. iii. 7-12.

they were precarious, so in course of time they were claimed as a right, and the right was established by the law of the land. It is only possible to say then that the State enforced the payment of tithe. It did not give them.

Mr. Justice Phillimore is often quoted, notably when he says that "the earliest tithe payers acted, no doubt, under the idea that they were under religious duty to give the tenth of their income to the Church. But when once this idea had taken root in public opinion anyone who refused to pay tithe was treated as a breaker of the law of the Church, and was subjected to excommunication. If this had no terrors for him, the aid of the secular arm was employed. . . and he was cast into prison. Thus the voluntary subscription became a tax." This extract, however, deals rather with the enforcement than the origin of tithes. Elsewhere, in his standard work, he says, "Endowments for the maintenance of clergy are derived principally from voluntary gifts, made for the purpose in ancient and modern times, the status of such gifts being that of offerings made to God for the maintenance of Divine Service, and of the cure of souls, by means of a ministry, to be sustained out of them. They consist chiefly of tithes, glebe lands, and funded property."¹

It may be argued that tithe is a private benefaction, judging by Mr. Asquith's opposition in 1905 to Sir John Gorst's Amendment in Committee that the Church in Wales should remain in possession

¹ "The Book of Church Law," tenth edition, 1905, p. 337.

of all endowments which a public court of law might decide to be private benefactions. Mr. Asquith replied that "it would be to give the Disestablished Church the whole of the tithe as it would be open to a court of law to decide that tithe on account of its voluntary origin was a private benefaction."

Apart from all argument, it seems manifestly unfair, that the tithe which is the private property of lay impropiators should be left untouched, while the tithe so long enjoyed by the Church is taken away.

It is quite a fallacy to suppose that tithe would be abolished by disendowment. It might not be paid to the clergyman, but it would still be paid. The only difference would be that there would be a change in the receiver. We may note also that Professor Freeman says, "The tithe can hardly be said to have been granted by the State. The case, rather, is that the Church preached the payment of tithes as a duty, and the State gradually came to enforce that duty by legal sanction." Lord Selborne bears similar testimony when he maintains "that tithes had not their origin in any secular enactment or grant is sufficiently proved by the fact that the suits for non-payment of tithes till very modern times were of ecclesiastical cognizance only, without any concurrent jurisdiction in temporal courts."

The Disestablishment Bill does not and can not abolish or reduce the tithe to be paid. No tithe-payer is relieved from payment of it. The laymen

who own the tithes need render no public service in return. The clergy do render public service of a valuable nature, but they are to be dispossessed, and the money devoted to the advancement of religion is to be diverted to secular uses. In days gone by Henry VIII. robbed the Church to enrich his courtiers, and thus lay rectors to-day draw money that rightly belongs to the clergy. They are to be left in possession, but the clergy must lose even what remains to them. Even if the contention be true that there were no tithes in Wales until after their payment was imposed as an obligation of law, the lay impropiator should not be allowed to retain his revenues if the clergy are to lose theirs. The Church, whether in England or in Wales, may be disestablished and disendowed, she may cease to be called "the Church of England," or "the Church in Wales," but she will still retain her glorious lineage as a branch of one Catholic and Apostolic Church, with her faith and doctrines, her ministry and sacraments as maintained through the centuries.

CHAPTER VI.

DISESTABLISHMENT AND DISENDOWMENT.

WH^Y should there be an Established Church in England to-day? The question demands and deserves consideration. It has been said that "the maintenance of an Established Church is harmful to the spiritual life of the nation, because it tends to foster a false conscience, and to make people think that national righteousness consists in the legal establishment of the Church rather than in the personal religion of individual men and women." We have previously said that it is not necessarily a great thing that a nation is "officially religious."

Is Privilege Justified To-day?

A forceful argument in favour of disestablishment is that "in a country where there are many forms of religion it is unjust and invidious that one should be maintained by the State in a position of privilege and pre-eminence." Formerly the Church was co-extensive with the nation. Now it is not. At the end of the seventeenth century scarcely one in

four of the population of this country was a dissenter.¹ To-day it is doubtful if half the people are even nominal church-people. The establishment of a Church or creed cannot be morally justified unless it represents a clear majority. This argument is by no means new, but it is none the less true. It was Paley who said, "If the dissenters from the establishment became a majority of the people, the establishment ought to be altered or qualified." As the will of the nation is the total will of the people composing it, and Parliament is its organ, so the religion of the nation is the sum total of the religion of the individuals, and the Church is its organ. But this organ must be representative of the great majority of the individuals, or it loses its claims.

Disestablishment is urged from another point of view.

What the Church would Gain.

The trend of to-day is towards democracy and the abolition of privilege, but, as we have previously pointed out, the privileges that remain are few, and are more than counterbalanced by the disabilities under which the Church is compelled to do her work, and indeed the Church in losing some privileges would gain others, for the bishops would no longer have seats in the House of Lords, but the clergy would be eligible for the House of

¹ Canon Overton. See also "The Free Church Year-book" and "The Anglican Year-book."

Commons. Private and official patronage would be abolished, and bishops would no longer be nominated by the Crown. This might conceivably be a great gain to the Church, and the same can be said of the withdrawal from Parliament of the control of the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church. The Acts of Supremacy,¹ the Submission of the Clergy,² the Ecclesiastical Appointments Acts,³ the Acts of uniformity and subscription to the thirty-nine articles would be repealed. All these placed the clergy under the authority of the State, and restricted the Church's liberty, but all this is theoretically defensible on the theory of establishment which then obtained. As convocation could enact and promulgate canons, which were binding upon the whole nation, then the Crown must have some control over its powers, and as the spiritual courts could enforce their judgments by fine and imprisonment, their decisions must be submitted to the Crown in Chancery or Council; hence the Submission of the Clergy Act was passed. As bishops were peers of the realm and feudal lords, the crown demanded a voice in their appointment. As conformity to the Church was, so to say, established by law, acts of uniformity and of subscription to the thirty-nine articles fixed by statute the formularies of the Church, and prevented any changes therein, without a fresh Act of Parliament. These various restrictions upon the liberty of the

¹ 26 Henry VIII., c. 1.

³ 25 Henry VIII., c. 20.

² 25 Henry VIII., c. 19.

Church are an anomaly since the granting of religious toleration in 1689.

The Effect of Disestablishment on the Church of Ireland.

Those who favour the disestablishment of the Church in Wales sometimes affect an interest in the welfare and progress of the Church, and, pointing to the disestablished Church of Ireland, argue that there would be peace and concord among the denominations, and that certain benefits would accrue to the Church. These contentions must be impartially examined. Religious differences have not been healed in Ireland. The cleavage between Romanism and Protestantism, and between Churchmanship and Presbyterianism is as strong as ever. Any willingness to work amicably together in social matters is due in Ireland, as in England, to a more reasonable spirit of Christianity, in no way connected with establishment or disestablishment.

Others maintain that within its own sphere of influence the Church of Ireland is the better for its severance from State control, but there is abundant testimony to the contrary. The interests of the poor have not been served, and the diminution of the number of clergy has made it difficult to provide a resident clergyman in many country parishes. In proof of this it has been publicly stated that between 1869 and the present time the number of clergy in Ireland decreased from 2,334

to 1,535, and 151 churches had to be closed.¹ The Archbishop of Armagh declared that "no one could disprove that every blessing that had followed the work of the Church of Ireland had been in spite of disestablishment and disendowment, and that everything that had followed in the way of adversity either to the Church or the country had been the direct and inevitable result of disestablishment and disendowment."² The Bishop of Ossory (Dr. Bernard) has said that³ disestablishment brought two gains to the Church in Ireland: (1) a more hearty co-operation between clergy and laity, and (2) the right of the Church to make her own laws; but he proceeded to add that these gains were outweighed by the losses. These he specified as (1) the loss to the nation at large of the only instrument by which it could speak with one voice to God, all recognition of religion having been removed from public life; (2) the horizon of the Church was narrowed, for the discipline of a "Free Church" must be more strict than the discipline of a Church upon which every member of the nation has a claim; and (3) the uniform system of Irish patronage tended to produce a uniform type of man. The second of these is endorsed by Mr. Gladstone, who said, a few years after he had disestablished the Irish Church, "I am bound, if my hon. friend challenges me to state

¹ The Archbishop of Armagh at Cardiff. See *Guardian*, May 17, 1912.

² *Ibid.*

³ "Forty Years of Disestablishment and Disendowment," the second of a series of Addresses on "The Lessons of Experience."

whether there is not more freedom for religious thought in the disestablished Church in Ireland, to say I willingly accept the challenge, and declare that she is less free than she was before."

The Effect of Disendowment in Ireland.

A sum of £8,080,000 was confiscated and given to purely secular objects—£1,000,000 for intermediate education, £600,000 to the Royal University, £1,300,000 to Teachers' Pension Fund, £1,500,000 to Congested Districts Board, £1,271,500 to distress works, £950,000 to arrears of rent account, £250,000 to sea fisheries, a grant of £372,331 to Maynooth (in lieu of an annual grant of £26,000 hitherto received), and a grant of £750,000 to Presbyterians (in lieu of an annual grant, with which William of Orange had endowed them), and £86,169 was given to miscellaneous appropriations. The cathedrals and churches were handed over to the Church, and the bishops, clergy, and lay officials were entitled, under the Act, to life annuities equal to the stipends they possessed at the time. The total of the annuities amounted to £596,913, which, based on actuarial figures, with the addition of a twelve per cent. bonus, represented a capital sum of seven and a half millions. Another half million was added in lieu of certain private benefactions, like Archbishop King's. The Representative Church Body was created, and concentrated on the preservation of this capital of £8,000,000. The interest did not pay

half the annuities, but voluntary subscriptions were generous, and there is now a capital of eight and a half millions, and few annuities now remain to be paid.

Disestablishment of the Church in Wales.

It is a misapplication of terms to speak of "the Welsh Church." Even "the Church in Wales" is a misnomer, for it is really "the Church of England in the Principality," for at about the same time as Britain became a Heptarchy, Wales was divided into four kingdoms, and Bangor, St. Asaph, St. Davids, and Llandaff became each the seat of a bishop, and these four dioceses remain to-day a part of the Province of Canterbury. Thus, "the Church in Wales" is as much a part of the Church of England as is the Church in Yorkshire or Kent. If, therefore, the question of disestablishment is to be settled by numerical demand, the mandate must come from the whole of England and Wales, and not from Wales alone. We are not now concerned to appraise the spiritual and moral value of a majority. The perils of statistical religion are great. It was Dr. Moberly who said "Wales cannot be a separate country merely for the purpose of disestablishment," and it is significant that the four federations of the Free Church Council in Wales considered whether it would not be advantageous to have a separate National Council for Wales, and decided that it would not, and so refused to set up a separate organization. This was the

original opinion of the Free Church Council, which began with one federation for England and Wales, and this policy was thus endorsed even under the influence of the wave of Welsh nationalism. It is a matter of historic interest that the several Welsh bishops acknowledged the primacy of Canterbury in the following order: Llandaff A.D. 1107, St. Davids A.D. 1115, Bangor A.D. 1120, and St. Asaph A.D. 1143, and as early as 1188 Archbishop Baldwin celebrated Holy Communion in each of the four Welsh cathedrals. The same laws, civil and ecclesiastical, govern both. Each diocese has the usual representatives in the Lower House, the four Welsh bishops sit in the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation and have seats in the House of Lords, according to seniority. The functions of English and Welsh bishops are identical. Mr. Gladstone said in 1870, "There is a complete ecclesiastical, legal, and—I may add—for every practical purpose, historical identity between the Church in Wales and the rest of the Church of England." To-day that union remains complete. In these respects the disestablishment of the Irish Church forms no precedent. The Irish Act of 1869 was passed "to dissolve the union created by Act of Parliament between the Churches of England and Ireland as by law established." Thus the union of the Churches of England and Ireland had a Parliamentary origin, the result of an agreement in 1800. The Irish Church was never represented in Convocation.

What Authority has Parliament over Convocation?

A Select Committee of the House of Lords was recently appointed to enquire and report whether the constitution of the Convocations has ever been altered by Act of Parliament without the consent and against the protest of Convocation. Evidence was given that the Irish Church Act contained no provision concerning Convocation. It was also stated that when, some thirty years ago, a mandamus was sought in the courts to compel the Archbishop of York to admit a Proctor, the mandamus was refused on the ground that Convocation was an independent body, not amenable to the court. Sir Lewis Dibden declared it would not be in accordance with constitutional practice that Parliament should take four dioceses out of Convocation, without the assent of that body, and he maintained that while Parliament can do anything, yet it has always regarded Convocation as a quasi-co-ordinate body, with whose constitution it has never interfered. The Archbishop of Canterbury quoted the authority of Bishop Stubbs for saying that when the clergy were summoned for taxation purposes the King's writ was essential, but on other occasions Convocation could be summoned without it. He contended that it was absolutely without precedent for Parliament to attempt to alter the constitution of Convocation, which is older than Parliament.

Reasons for the Disestablishment of the Church in Wales.

The supporters of the disestablishment of the Church in Wales make out a case which at any rate deserves careful consideration. The Prime Minister summarized it by saying, "I do not remember that a case so strong and so irresistible has ever been presented to any Legislature in the world." ¹ In another speech elsewhere he spoke of "the long delayed claim of the Welsh people for religious equality." ²

It is only possible here to tabulate briefly the reasons given for the demand.

(a) It is the maintenance in a position of privilege of one of many religious communities, and this fosters a sense of injustice. (b) When the State assumes neutrality to all Churches and creeds, a new impulse will be given to the national conscience. (c) The Church in Wales is the Church of a small minority. The figures of the report of the Royal Commission on the Church of England and other religious bodies in Wales are quoted, and show the Church of England communicants to number 193,081 or 9.6 per cent., and the total number of members of the various dissenting denominations, exclusive of Romanists, 550,280, or 27.3 per cent. The population of Wales in 1901 was 2,012,876. (d) All State establishments of religion are wrong. (e) National

¹ Mr. Asquith in the House of Commons, April, 1909.

² At the Albert Hall, December, 1910.

property should be used for strictly national purposes, and not for the benefit of a portion of the people. (f) The Irish Church gained, by disendowment, in spiritual life, in self-sacrifice, and true churchmanship.

The Answer to these Points.

These contentions may be answered as follows : (a) In a democratic age it is natural that privilege should be assailed, and it will only be conceded where there is indisputable claim to it. History and tradition can claim it, but can public opinion do so ? If the Church has a real hold upon the affection and loyalty of the majority of the people, then they will demand it, but is there a real majority to demand it ? (b) If it can be proved beyond doubt that the national conscience would receive new impulse, then, indeed, the strongest argument for the maintenance of the establishment is gone. Can it be so proved ? (c) One side says one thing, and the other side another. Is it really impossible to get at the figures ? Churchmen have claimed a census, Dissenters apparently object to one. There are many, however, who would not be much impressed by mere figures. They know only too well how many there are who in reply to the question of "religious persuasion" say, "Put me down Church." (d) If it will be universally conceded that State establishment is wrong, it may be opportune to act upon such a view, but this will

not justify piecemeal, disestablishment, for it would be as reasonable to disestablish the Church in Yorkshire as to disestablish the four Dioceses in Wales.

(e) We have already given strong evidence that the Church of Ireland losses were greater than her gains by disestablishment. (f) The question of national property opens up the whole subject of disendowment.

Are Disestablishment and Disendowment Inseparable?

That disestablishment and disendowment are inseparable is the view of all practical politicians. This view is based entirely upon the argument that the endowments are national property. In a sense this is true, for when the ancient endowments were given to churchmen, they were given to the nation, for all were churchmen. No one dares to take away modern endowments, which were given ostensibly to churchmen, and churchmen only. It is therefore argued concerning ancient endowments that they must be judged quite apart from the wishes of the founders, who knew nothing about present-day changes and situations. The whole question is very difficult to decide, and it is scarcely fair to call those who favour disendowment thieves and robbers, as is the way of virulent partisans and inflamed politicians. There are many who think it a mistake to insist upon disendowment, and they argue that the Church has a moral title to the ancient endowments, and they should be left to

her, provided the privilege and prestige of establishment are taken away. Yet this argument has another side. The Church's moral title is seriously weakened if it is maintained that the post-Reformation Church differs much from the pre-Reformation Church. Ancient endowments were given to the latter. Is it quite certain that pious donors would be satisfied with the Church as it is to-day? If it were not for the complications thus arising it would be quite practical to disestablish without disendowing. It is to the shame of the Church that an argument can be brought forth, part of which, at any rate, we are unable to refute. Ancient endowments were given to the Church and to the nation, for the two were at the time synonymous. They were given for the benefit of the people, for educational and social as well as ecclesiastical purposes. The Church can only claim as adherents half the population of England, and of these many are only nominal churchmen. The Church has now lost its representative title, and in a sense is no longer fulfilling functions for the whole nation, which now numbers so many different denominations separated from her.

A Possible Compromise.

It may yet be that a compromise will be effected. To many it might take this form, the Church willing to yield the privilege of establishment, the Dissenters agreeing that all endowments, both ancient and modern, be left to the Church. It would be difficult

for churchmen to insist on the privilege of establishment if the people were told the number of adherents she could to-day claim, and if the churchmanship of the many thousands of nominal churchmen was described by those who know.

It is obvious that if there is no doubt that the endowments were left to the Church as distinct from the nation, then the aliation of them may be considered robbery. Roughly, the total income of the Church in Wales is £260,037. The Bill proposes to transfer £172,901 to County or Borough Councils and the University of Wales. If we look into specific cases we see that the result works disastrously, *e.g.* Llandudno would be left with an endowment of £5, and S. Saviour's, Roath, with a working class population of 20,000, would have £45, instead of £254, while in the Diocese of S. Asaph 128 out of 208 parishes would lose every penny of endowment they possess. It is a pity then that these endowments cannot be left alone, in the interests of the people and in the interests of peace.

It is no use the clergy arguing that this is no concession to leave them what is theirs by right. The Church's title is not clear beyond all doubt. It cannot be maintained indisputably that the whole of the ancient endowments were given to the Church for the purpose of propagating certain principles in accord with those of the donors. If it can be so proved, then the question arises, Are those principles still being carried out? If not, then they are forfeit. This line of thought does not mean any

admission of a transference of endowments from the Church of Rome to the Church of England, but only that it is arguable that the Church to-day is not teaching exactly what the Church was erroneously teaching just before the Reformation. It is possible that benefactors may—we need not say they did—have approved that teaching in its Romeward drift. Historical continuity is not invalidated by such an argument, but in a sense the spiritual and ecclesiastical continuity may have been momentarily broken, as has been suggested by a churchman, who said, “The thirty-nine articles embody a widely different system of theology from that which prevailed in the pre-Reformation Church, and I cannot conceive myself that the persons who made gifts to the Church in mediæval times would have bequeathed their lands to the Church had they known that as a body the Church was about to rebel against the See of Peter.”¹

Precedent for Transference of Endowments.

Unionists must be very careful that they have “clean hands” when they protest against the transference of endowments from ecclesiastical to educational purposes. Lord Hugh Cecil, Sir William Anson, and others backed a private Bill in the House, which proposed to sever the Rectory of Gatcombe from the Principalship of S. Edmund’s Hall, Oxford, and to divert £150 of the endowment from the former to the latter. It was, no doubt, excellent

¹ G. W. E. Russell.

as a practical reform, but it meant the diversion of funds all the same, and the staunch opponents of the Welsh Bill deserved Mr. King's reproof in the House. Again, no one will dare to talk of spoliation and robbery if he or his friends own land that once was consecrated to the service of God and His poor, but was transferred, as a reward, from religious houses to private hands.

If the opponents of the establishment are right to take this line of argument, they are asked to allow the Church to keep what might legitimately be taken, but as they are willing to leave the buildings to the Church, this is a precedent in the right direction. It does not seem right, however, to take these buildings into consideration in any estimation of the amount of endowment that is to be left to the Church, for although the buildings may be valued at £40,000,000, yet they are not a source of revenue, far otherwise, and there could be no sale of such buildings from which to make up the endowments. In calculating the amount of income still to be left to the Church the life interests of the incumbents must be counted, for these could be capitalized, though it must be remembered that these are only offered to those who decide to resign their benefices within five years of the passing of the Bill into law.

A Reasonable Claim.

There is another reason why the money should be left as it is. The Dissenter's Chapel Act of 1844

says that if a dissenting denomination can show twenty-five years' title to its endowments, it shall be secured in their retention. Even if the Church of England were created in the time of King Henry VIII. she would still possess a title of 350 years. To take money left for one object and to divert it to another would cause doubt and uneasiness in the minds of the people.

A Disinterested Opinion.

In a controversy it is sometimes helpful to get the view of an uninterested party. The Roman Catholics, judging by a leading article in the *Tablet*, the official organ of the Anglo-Roman hierarchy, characterize the proposal to disendow as an act "of whole confiscation." There strong and uncompromising words are used: "We have not the slightest sympathy with the Government proposals to seize property consecrated by long usage to the service of religion, and to apply it to secular purposes. When the money taken from the support of the parsonages is to be turned to such frivolous secular uses as the erection of local museums and rural art galleries, it cannot be contended that such a case of imperative public necessity has been made out as would alone justify such an act of wholesale confiscation."

Life and Liberty.

The promoters of a new movement ¹ are out

¹ "Life and Liberty in the Church of England."

“ to secure for the Church full power to control its own life, even at the cost, if necessary, of disestablishment, and of whatever consequences that may possibly involve.” The promoters desire “ to revive waning enthusiasms and hopes,” and to bring such pressure to bear upon official bodies that very real reforms may be effected.

CHAPTER VII.

CHURCH REFORM.

Report of Committee on Church and State.

BEFORE the Church can claim freedom to legislate she must appeal with a united and with no uncertain voice and present a forward and aggressive policy. The first step towards this consummation was taken in the Representative Church Council on July 4, 1913, when the now famous resolution was passed:

“That there is in principle no inconsistency between a national recognition of religion and the spiritual independence of the Church, and this Council requests the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to consider, the advisability of appointing a Committee to inquire what changes are advisable in order to secure in the relations of Church and State a fuller expression of the spiritual independence of the Church as well as of the national recognition of religion.”

¹ This Committee has duly issued its Report, which

is now being discussed throughout the dioceses of England.

The proposed Church Council is to consist of three Houses—a House of Bishops, a House of Clergy, and a House of Laity. Voting is to be by orders, if demanded by ten persons, with the intention that no measure shall pass unless it is approved by a majority of each House. The present Lower House of Convocation will be reformed, and made more fully representative of all priests licensed to officiate, while the *ex-officio* members will be a minority, and not, as now, a majority.

The establishment of a Legislative Committee is recommended, which will be the link between the Church Council and the Privy Council and Parliament. It is further proposed to form an Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council, appointed by the King on the advice of the Prime Minister.

Thus, by way of illustration, if and when the Church Council, in its three Houses, has agreed to a certain measure affecting the Church, which, however, needed the amendment or otherwise of an existing statute, the proposed measure would be handed to the Legislative Committee of the Council, which would in turn hand it to the Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council, and this last would consider it from the point of view of the State. So far, the chief difficulty in obtaining a unanimous approval of the Church and State report centres round the franchise.

The Franchise.

Who shall have the right to vote for the Parochial Church Council, which is the first step towards the Church Council? Shall it be given (*a*) only to communicants, or (*b*) to those of communicant status, *i.e.* those who have been confirmed, or (*c*) to those who have been baptized, and declare they are not members of any other Church? Opinion is sharply divided on this question. The Bishop of Manchester contends that as sixty-nine per cent. of children born in England are baptized in the Church—or, in other words, seven-tenths of parents confess allegiance to the Church, and are assured their infants are incorporated into Christ's Church—these infants should not be disfranchized, especially in view of the obstacles, amounting to persecution, which prevent the wage-earning lad or lass from being confirmed. For such it requires a great effort of will to be confirmed, whereas it is difficult for a public school boy to resist it. Thus the franchise on a communicant basis is made easy for the rich and difficult for the poor. The Bishop has a further objection to the narrow franchise, which means that a communicant franchise would mean 2,500,000, or a franchise of those confirmed 5,000,000 out of a population of 22,000,000 Church people in a nation of 33,000,000. He objects to Confirmation or Holy Communion becoming statutory tests.¹ The Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Hensley Henson, and others agree with him.

¹ Charge to the Manchester Diocesan Conference, 1917.

On the other hand, the Dean of Christ Church desires to break down the "paralysing conviction that membership is a passive right, and not a spiritual privilege, involving duties. To test effective Church membership by baptism and a declaration rivets on the Church a most galling fetter. What we want to say is that the baptized person who never makes any real sign of membership is not fulfilling a Churchman's duties by not formally joining any other body. . . . At present the communicant is an exceptional person."

Dr. Gore is in agreement with this view, when he says, "To allow the unconfirmed to exercise the right of a membership he refuses is dishonouring to the Church and demoralizing to the individual."

It will be seen that, as always, there are two sides to this and every question, but no doubt a "way out" will be found.

"Liberty to act when the collective wisdom of the Church desires to act is essential to the efficient discharge of its functions." ¹ This collective wisdom will find its expression when the Representative Church Council receives statutory recognition and the authority to exercise full powers of self-legislation, subject to a parliamentary veto. The whole field of Church reform is so covered by Acts of Parliament that it is almost unreasonable to expect that Parliament would concede to the Church while established the right to repeal Acts of Parlia-

¹ Rev. W. Temple, "The Parliament of the Church."—Church Government Papers, No. 9. S.P.C.K.

ment without reserving to itself some veto. The Church must shake herself free from the paralysing thought that changes are disagreeable, and that "things had better remain as they are."

Extension of the Episcopate.

We cannot create a new diocese without amending Acts of Parliament.¹ At the Reformation Archbishop Cranmer had a scheme for sixty-three Bishoprics, and at the time the population of England was only the same as that of London to-day. What is the position to-day? The population of England is seven times larger, and we have only forty dioceses, or, to put it another way, there were twenty-six dioceses in 1846, when the population of England and Wales was 16,000,000, and there are only forty to-day with a population of over 37,000,000. To-day, therefore, there should be sixty dioceses. There are a certain number of Bishops Suffragan, but, practically, they have no responsibility, and their position is by no means satisfactory. At present there are difficulties on all sides, as we have seen when the idea of a new diocese is mooted. Sometimes the difficulty of raising the money is emphasized, but churchmen will readily find it for a new diocese, if and when they believe in the scheme, and it is the business of the Church to make the necessity plain and practicable. There is always plenty of money available

¹ 6 & 7 William IV., c. 77.

for a good cause. Four people found £50,000 each for a university at Reading, and any amount of money will be spent on a picture or a bit of china.

The Abolition of Deaneries.

Drastic reform is necessary in several directions, and vast sums of money can be more usefully employed than at present. Why cannot the deaneries, with the possible exception of York and Canterbury, be suppressed, and the revenues used for the endowment of new bishoprics? Something between £30,000 and £40,000 a year would thus be available from this source alone. There would be a further advantage in this suppression. It would do away with the dual control as now existing. We need to return to the original conception of a bishop "with his stool in his own central church, surrounded by his chief counsellors, who form his Cathedral Chapter, his church being his central workshop, the canons his trusted workmen, and himself the foreman." ¹ One of the canons might act as vice-dean, the bishop being his own dean. The vice-dean could attend to the detail business of a cathedral.

From the point of view of Catholic custom and tradition, it is quite wrong that a bishop should have no rights in his own cathedral. In some cases he cannot preach there without the permission of the Dean and Chapter.

¹ Bishop of Worcester (Dr. Yeatman-Biggs).

The "Fatal Opulence of Bishops."

Closely connected with the increase of the Episcopate is the erroneous idea that the bishops are opulent. It is a huge mistake to think that they grow rich out of their emoluments. Ignorant people sneer and criticize because the Bishop of London has £10,000 a year. They ignore or forget the fact that he has to bear the heavy expenses of keeping up two large houses. He has recently pointed out that "rates and taxes account for £5,000 to start with,"¹ and it will be remembered that when he suggested his Diocesan Board of Finance should take over his official income and the two houses, and give him a smaller house and an allowance, the suggestion was declined because the outgoings were too great. Small wonder! Think of the enormous outlay! These magnificent, picturesque, historic residences are an expensive luxury, which the bishop does not need or want. The reformer says, "get rid of them," the conservative says, "they are a great asset, and rightly express the dignity, not of an individual but of the head of diocesan corporate life." No one but a bishop and his intimates has any conception of the vast outlay upon travelling, hospitality, charity, and a large domestic and official staff. Let the palaces be paid for and utilized by the diocese either as the headquarters, or as a church house, training college, or as homes of rest for aged and retired clergy,

¹ Annual Meeting, Church Reform League, June 21, 1917.

after the example of Hampton Court Palace. The bishops might then have smaller and less expensive houses, and they would require a correspondingly less income. It is simply grotesque to argue that a bishop needs a large house in order chiefly to "put up" ordination candidates at the Ember season. If the palaces cannot be utilized as indicated, it is difficult to decide what to do with them. Even the drastic reformer would not be ready to sell them for a Roman Catholic monastery or a Dissenters' college, but if they would serve a useful purpose for other denominations, surely they would equally well serve it for the Church of England. Some people hold that these large houses are not really a scandal in the opinion of the nation at large, and do not estrange the working classes. It is not without significance that when two successive Bishops of Worcester have expressed a desire or a readiness to give up Hartlebury Castle local feeling was entirely against such action. It would be a step in the right direction if the New Diocesan Boards of Finance agreed to take over these episcopal residences, and to use them as diocesan buildings. In Bishop Selwyn's words, let us "double the numbers and halve the incomes," and there will be the requisite increase of the episcopate.

Cathedral Chapters.

Business men cannot be blamed when they tell us we do not make the best use of existing resources. Take, by way of illustration, our Cathedral Chapters.

Why should the rank and file slave the livelong year for a mere pittance, while a few highly placed individuals obtain positions as canons-residentiary, often through private or political influence, and draw a splendid twelve months' pay for three months' very light work, and continue to hold these positions long after they are able adequately to fulfil even the light duties attaching to their office? We remember reading an account ¹ of a certain cathedral, in which the senior canon could walk to the lectern to read the lessons, but when he got there he was too blind to see to read them. The second canon could read the lessons, but could not walk as far as the lectern. The third could walk as far, and could see to read, but he might as well have left the lessons alone, for no one could hear a word he said, and the fourth was a septuagenarian. It is all very well for bishops and others to reply in indignation and protest that this is exceptional. There is no room for a single exception of this sort.

The Bishop of London's words are worth quoting in this connexion: "People may not say much, but they think the more when they see two aged canons led from their stalls in turn to read the lessons. I know one chapter where every canon is nearly eighty. When you speak of a working Church you must justify it as a working Church in the eyes of the democracy, and we have got to do that."²

¹ By Mr. de Winton.

² Annual Meeting, Church Reform League, June 21, 1917.

We read in a Church newspaper¹ of a unique service in a certain cathedral, in which the prayers were said by a gentleman aged eighty-five, the first lesson was read by one of eighty-three, the second by a clergyman of eighty-four, the epistle by another aged eighty-two, and the gospel by one who was eighty-five. It is certainly unique, and we are glad it is.

It would make for efficiency, and would set free large annual sums for other work, if each residentiary held his canonry on the distinct understanding that he combined with it some diocesan work, as the head of education, or of finance, or of Sunday schools, or of missions in the diocese, but there should be an end to the endowment of professorships and other offices by canonries in distant cathedrals.² It would be good work to raise money to set such canonries free. The Dean of Worcester very rightly says with regard to the cathedral establishments, "If the dean and canons are regarded as a body whose sole duty is the conduct of the cathedral services, then there is great waste of money and power, but if they are connected with the Mother Church as persons engaged in the central work of the diocese . . . which the parochial clergy are unable to perform, then the cathedral revenues are not wasted. . . . Viewed as diocesan officers, the remuneration of cathedral canons is

¹ *The Guardian*, 1914.

² A Canonry at Rochester is attached to the Oriel Professorship at Oxford.

not excessive for the work required.”¹ At present these stalls are in some cases rather like richly endowed alms-houses for the aged and infirm! Once again Acts of Parliament are in the way. We cannot reform our cathedral system without amending them.²

Whatever a man's position, whether as cathedral dignitary or as incumbent, he should cease to hold office and to draw its emoluments as soon as he is incapable of fulfilling its duties; but here again we are up against Acts of Parliament.

The Parson's Freehold.

It would be difficult to touch this question without altering or amending the Common and Statute Law of the Realm. As with cathedral dignitaries, so must it be with incumbents. There must be a limitation to the tenure of benefices. “This word and fact of ‘freehold’ seems sometimes to be treated as though it were our one foundation principle. There is a sort of mysterious spell and fascination about it. We are warned not to come near or touch it. It is clung to, it is idolized, with an almost superstitious reverence. But it is the stronghold of the scandals which discredit and weaken us through the length and breadth of the land.”³ But while it is in the interests of all

¹ “Wealth of the Church: Possible Reforms.” A series of Articles in the *National News*.

² 3 & 4 Victoria, c. 113.

³ From a paper written in 1886, and endorsed in 1889, by the late Rev. R. C. Moberly, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church.

concerned, the Incumbents' Resignation Act will require drastic amendment. The incumbent who is about to retire ought not to be treated as though he were a prisoner on trial. He ought to know how much retiring allowance will be granted to him. Instead he must first sign the deed of resignation, and then throw himself on the mercy of the Commission appointed to determine the amount of his allowance. He has no appeal, and in any case he is not allowed to remain in the vicarage, which has been his beloved home for many years. It should not be necessary to enquire into his private means. Bishops are treated very differently. There is no enquiry about their private means; they know beforehand what the retiring allowance will be, and may continue to occupy the palace. An adequate pension scheme must be introduced without further delay, and there must be an end of the iniquitous system of pensioning a man by taking the amount of pension from his successor's stipend. We are as yet far behind the Colonial Church even in the matter of pensions.

Poor Stipends and Large Houses.

Under the Parsonage Act, 1838, parsonage houses can be sold, with the consent of the archbishop, bishop, and patron. Fuller advantage should be taken of this. To a miserable stipend is often added a huge house with extensive grounds, including stabling for several horses, and other outbuildings.

Apart from the hardships of such a position, the moral effect on the parish is not good. The people imagine there is a stipend commensurate with the size of the house. The whole matter of stipends must be examined and explained. It is all very well to blame the laity. They do not know the facts. When they know them something may be done. It is scandalous that half the benefices in England are open only to those with private means. This is almost the first qualification for the vacancy, and it ought to be the last.

Private patrons of starvation benefices should be compelled to provide an adequate stipend, or to hand over the advowson to the Bishop, or to a Diocesan Board of Patronage. Let a list of such patrons and their benefices be published broadcast, and let there be some sort of a "Trades Union" among the clergy. If these benefices are transferred to public patronage, the endowment can be adequately increased, but it would not be right to increase it for the benefit of the patron, who could then get a better price for the advowson if and when he sells it.

There was recently a letter in a Church newspaper from a clerical patron, who complained of the difficulty he had in finding a clergyman to accept a vacant benefice. One after another said, "I cannot afford it," and when at last he found some one rich enough to accept the offer, people said it was "simoniacal." He was unable to provide a better endowment, as he was unable to afford it. He

should have handed over his rights to those who can. It is strange that patrons are not ashamed publicly to advertise for applicants for vacant incumbencies. "Wanted Vicar. Strictly moderate. Good private means"; "Musical, with some private means. Married. Stipend £150." "Moderate views; stipend about £100." "Stipend £120, possibly slight increase. Married Vicar required, with private means." "Income about £90 per annum." "It is essential the Incumbent should have private means, the net stipend being £100." "Large house, good private means required." "Net income about £60, good house and garden." "Income, net, £170. Applicants must have private income up to £400 a year"—are some of the advertisements culled from the Church papers. Some patrons are not only unashamed but are audacious enough to mention attractions which they themselves do not provide. In one case there was offered "£80 per annum, with beautiful country and pure air"! It was announced in the press that a parish near Godalming was without a rector for twelve months. It is not surprising when we are informed that the living is £200 a year, with a rectory, "a big roomy building . . . in a very dilapidated state." The incoming rector would have to spend nearly £1,000 in putting the old rectory into an inhabitable condition. There has hitherto been a striking parallel between the Church and the Army, in that each has looked to men with private means to be officers. It is reminiscent of the old

feudal spirit. Time was perhaps when either profession was rather in the nature of "an easy job," suitable to a gentleman. That time is now past. To-day the officer and the clergyman have a strenuous life of duty, and there is a demand here, as everywhere, for efficiency. Now is the opportunity for radical reform in both professions. We can no longer be satisfied with prestige and privilege, with social status and private means.

But there is no "short-cut." The Reformer says, "Let all the incomes be pooled, then a fairer re-division may be made. He evidently is under the impression that in days gone by the Church by special mismanagement endowed one benefice well and another badly. This was not the case, of course. A donor endowed some one parish. If that money is not now being misused, the diversion of it is not justifiable. Even if endowments might be pooled the average of each would be considerably less than is generally supposed, and in any case we ought not to avail ourselves of an expedient to save our own pockets by helping ourselves to the contents of other people's.

A Barbarous Method of Stipend.

Reform is urgent in the direction of putting an end to the present barbarous method of paying the country clergy according, as the *Guardian* puts it, to "the machinations of wheat-rings in Chicago. the number of acres ploughed up in North-West

Canada, or the extent of the rainfall in Russia or Argentina."

Formerly there was a tithe of certain produce of the land. This was commuted by a tithe rent-charge, which was created pursuant to the Act of 1836. The factors in the calculation are the prices of barley, wheat, and oats for the preceding seven years. The value has very considerably fluctuated. For many years, from 1883-1901, each £100 of tithe rent-charge steadily dropped, till in 1901 it was £66 10s. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. In 1911 it was £71 4s. 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ d., and in 1917 has risen to £92 1s. 0 $\frac{1}{4}$ d.¹ For 1918 it will be £109 3s. 11d. There is talk now that the tithe owner is getting an unreasonable advantage, and is, in effect, a "profiteer," and that something should be done to restrain any further rise. This seems very unfair to the poor clergy, who for so many years have suffered poverty through the low price of produce, and no one seemed to care, and certainly no efforts were made to cover their loss, and now at last he is getting something like his due, and people complain of him! It is well to point out that in the whole period of the eighty-one years since the passing of the Tithe Act of 1836 the tithe owner has only received an average of £91 11s. 3 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. for every £100. A statutory bargain was made in 1836; the clergy have kept it. Let them continue it now that the "lean years" are past. If any question is raised of modifying the bargain, the claim should be made that the intention of the Act

¹ See "Willich's Tithe Commutation Tables." Longmans.

was to entitle the tithe owner "to receive such a sum as would be equal in relative purchasing power to £100 in 1836," but since every incident of our daily life has altered, the time seems ripe to sell the tithes, in order that the proceeds of the sale may be invested for the permanent endowment of the benefice. The difficulty of a redemption scheme lies in the calculation of the capital value. Where no agreement can be arrived at, the Board of Agriculture allows the landowner to purchase redemption on payment of twenty-five years' purchase of the par value of tithe rent-charge. With tithe at a low level few would wish to purchase; more will be willing to do so now. It is almost too much to hope that the State might redeem all tithe rent-charge by taking a charge upon the lands, which could be repaid by annual sums for a given period. Such a system might even be applied to landowners, and the Board of Finance would be the central receiving office.

Reform of Patronage.

At present, with the best intentions in the world, the laymen, other than patrons, have very little inducement to increase the incomes of their clergy, for they have no voice in their appointment, nor can they be rid of them if and when they are incapable of performing their duties adequately. There is need then of Patronage Reform, and it must begin at the top. It is granted that the parishioners

have a legitimate grievance when they complain that they have no voice in the appointment of their incumbent.

Why should a diocese have a bishop set over it without being consulted? It should be permissible to submit names to the Prime Minister for a final selection.

The Prime Minister at the moment, who is the principal patron, having at his disposal all the deaneries, many canonries, nearly two hundred benefices, and a Regius Professorship of Divinity, is a Baptist, and so out of sympathy with an Established Church. The present Lord Chancellor (Lord Finlay), who is a member of the Church of Scotland, has in his gift a dozen canonries and nearly seven hundred benefices. The Home Secretary (Sir G. Cave), who has the patronage of some fifty benefices happens to be a churchman, but his predecessor in office is a Jew. What do these men know about the needs or the man? It is an anomalous position for a bishop to have no voice in the selection of the chief men of his diocese. It is no argument that the appointments of bishops and other dignitaries by the Prime Minister and others have worked well in practice. Appointments by the Church would work equally well or perhaps better. The system of private patronage has worked fairly well also, and it is probably better than an election by the parishioners, but they should, at least, have some voice in the appointment—that is to say, if they provide an adequate stipend.

Reform in Appointment to Bishoprics.

With regard to the appointment of Bishop by the Crown, the Archbishop of Canterbury says: "It is a mode of procedure which is theoretically open to easy objection, and I should, for obvious reasons, be the last to contend that it always works well in practice. I feel bound in honesty to say that I grow increasingly certain that any change of system would, so far as I can judge, be to the detriment and not the gain of the Church. . . . I doubt whether among those who are competently informed there are many who would regard a new mode of electing bishops as being among the gains, if any, which disestablishment would bring."¹ His Grace reminds us that "the ultimate power rests with the ecclesiastical authority, be it chapter or archbishop, upon whom these responsibilities are laid, and who could (and, if need arose, certainly would) decline to act and be prepared to abide the consequences." This is theoretically true, but if the nomination were refused this would not have the slightest effect, for the nominee of the Crown would be appointed by letters patent. Even so, an archbishop might refuse to consecrate but a refusal on his part to confirm, invest, and consecrate within twenty days would expose him to the pains of *præmunire*.² There would be one further action possible. The new bishop might, like Bishop Timothy Hall of Oxford in 1687, find himself "alone in his palace, deserted and shunned by his clergy." It can be

¹ Visitation Charge, 1912.² 25 Henry VIII.

argued that the Prime Minister is really the representative of the people, because, with a majority of votes in an elected Parliament, he is nominated by the Crown, and further, that he does not actually appoint the bishops, as the Crown has a real voice, and can refuse the name submitted.

Originally the selection of the bishop was almost entirely the sovereign's. George III. was very annoyed when his minister promised a bishopric without consulting him. It is well known that the late Queen Victoria insisted, on occasion, upon a definite voice in the selection, and the appointment of a certain divine to a bishopric may have been made chiefly because the late King Edward VII. prophesied he would soon be a bishop. More lately, the Prime Minister has really made the appointment, but it would be anomalous if the Prime Minister were a Roman Catholic and could, as Prime Minister, appoint to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, and yet be debarred, as a Roman Catholic, from presenting to the smallest benefice! There are four possible alternatives in the method of appointment: (a) by the Prime Minister, as now; (b) by the Dean and Chapter, which is the Roman Catholic method; (c) by the body of Bishops, as in Ireland and Scotland, if the Synod cannot agree; and (d) by Synod. There are two other precedents: (1) In 1695 William III. appointed six bishops to advise him on matters of church patronage.¹

¹ In 1681 Charles II. appointed a commission for a similar purpose.

Such a commission, in these days, would take note, it is hoped, of the needs of a diocese, and not of a certain person's claims to preferment. (2) In the Established Church of Sweden, the King fills vacant Sees, but his choice is limited to three names submitted by the clergy of the vacant See. In the case of an archbishopric, perhaps three names might be selected by the bishops of the province.

An Archaic Farce.

In any case, the *congé d'élire*, or "permission to choose," is an archaic farce. It will be said it preserves a principle and an ideal, and if an unsuitable person were recommended, a Chapter might refuse to elect him, as the Dean refused Dr. Hampden, who was appointed Bishop of Hereford. Presumably, no bad appointments are made in modern days!!

Meantime, practical men say it is silly that a Chapter should be solemnly summoned to elect a man who, to all intents and purposes, is already chosen without regard to their wishes. Reformers would like a chapter to be daring enough, some day, to insist upon their rights, and to refuse to elect the Prime Minister's choice.

Party Trusts.

Worse than all systems of patronage is the "Party" Trust. "Nothing can justify them, except want of faith in the Church itself, and not

even theory can justify the results.”¹ There are, probably, some six hundred “derelict” benefices, *i.e.* those not belonging to a manor. These are saleable in the open market, and are at the mercy of any buyer who wants them. “Trustees” swoop down and buy them, for the promotion of some particular group of dogmas, not necessarily acceptable to the parishioners even at the time of purchase. Parishes change greatly in process of time, yet for all time the parishioners are pledged to the pronouncement by their incumbent of certain party shibboleths. Perhaps the way is clearing for Diocesan Trusts or Patronage Boards, on which both bishop and parish are represented. It has been objected that this would result in “a most excellent selection of mediocrities,” whereas in the present variety of systems the really capable men will be selected by some one. This is doubtful. The Archbishop of Dublin (Dr. Bernard), writing with reference to Patronage Boards in Ireland, says: “Ours is a democratic system, and if it has the advantages which democracy enjoys, it has also the defects of its qualities. It tends to give the control of patronage sometimes to men whose horizon is extremely limited, and who have little knowledge of Church life beyond the borders of their own parish. But a more serious defect is that it is increasingly difficult to provide for clergy who have not got popular gifts. A quiet, scholarly man, with a love for pastoral work, may do excellent work in

¹ Bishop of Worcester (Dr. Yeatman-Biggs).

a rural parish, even though he be a dull preacher and unable to play golf. . . . Variety of patronage is good for the Church, and this we have lost in Ireland."¹

At any rate, there has been a move in the right direction. The Benefices Act of 1898 has extended the bishop's right to refuse institution, and has recognized the right of the parishioners to be consulted. This Act abolished the sale of "next presentation," *i.e.* the right by purchase to present at the vacancy next ensuing; it has abolished the sale of donatives, and the sale by auction of benefices, except where there are a hundred acres or more of land to be held with them, and the insistence that a year must elapse between the purchase of an advowson and the exercise of patronage is all to the good.

Fees.

There is need of reform in the matter of fees, not only at institution and induction, but on resignation, and on other occasions. Bishops are at present liable for huge fees and expenses on entering upon their Sees. Incumbents must pay fees for going into and for going out of a benefice. A fee of 18s. is paid by every parish at the archdeacon's annual visitation. These fees do not go into the archdeacon's pocket, but to the chancellor, registrar, and apparitor. It is not fair to say

¹ "National Review": "Forty Years of Disestablishment in Ireland."

that these fees go to enrich certain officials who do nothing to earn them, but it is fair to argue that the services might be rendered unnecessary, or at any rate be curtailed, without any practical disadvantage.

Dilapidations.

Many a clergyman dare not resign because he is afraid to meet the cost of the dilapidations. It is not generally realized that an incumbent is compelled by law to keep his vicarage house, outbuildings, and fences in repair. It often happens that a man cannot afford any outlay. On his death, the bill must be paid out of his estate, and his widow may be thereby beggared; and if he leaves no estate, the incoming incumbent must pay the bill. The repair of parsonage houses should be a diocesan obligation, and a scheme of insurance against the cost should be inaugurated in every diocese. We are afraid of taking a strong line; we fight shy of "compulsion." There ought to be compulsory retirement, a compulsory pension scheme, and compulsory insurance against dilapidations by means of a fair annual payment supplemented by diocesan grants.

Exchange of Benefices.

It is manifestly wrong to send a man in his youth and strength to be incumbent of a tiny parish, and to allow him to remain there for a lifetime. It

is equally wrong to allow a man to grow grey in a huge parish, and to remain there long after his powers and strength can cope with its heavy demands. There are abundant instances of both cases. The laity very naturally ask why two such men may not exchange. The matter of endowment is generally the first bar to such a reasonable suggestion. There are young men eating their hearts out in isolated country parishes. They are not country men. Why did they accept a country benefice? Because they desired an independent sphere and security of tenure. Benefices are not too frequently offered, and a man feels bound to accept the one that is offered. We have no desire to depreciate the work of the country clergy.

It would be quite wrong to suppose that old men will in every case do quite well in the country. In widely scattered parishes, what can be expected of a rector crippled perhaps with rheumatism? Can he get about among the people, and is he likely to influence the lads and young men as a younger man can do? Are there no evils in the country that anyone will suffice as minister? Perhaps the best country parson is the scholar who is not too old, and not too much of a bookworm. There are men who, correspondingly, have worked in towns, but they are not town-bred. They want to work, but it must be less exacting work. When negotiations are opened for an exchange to the mutual advantage of two clergy and of both parishes concerned, we find perhaps the town living has a large

and expensive house and a poor endowment, while the country benefice has a small and inexpensive modern house and a fair endowment, or, as more often occurs, the positions are reversed. Thus an exchange is impossible, and two men and two parishes suffer. The Church does not make the best use of her resources. She sends a brilliant scholar to a huge parish, and a young fellow of average attainments is sent to a tiny place. Think of the permanent and invaluable contributions that have been made by the clergy to theological science. Let the men who can enrich our libraries and give us inspiration by their writings find opportunity in secluded parishes, in which they will give faithful ministry to their little flock and pursue their studies in sacred and profane learning.

The Union of Benefices.

An amalgamation of benefices is favoured in many quarters. This seems a shortsighted policy. A resident clergyman in every parish is surely the ideal to be maintained. A few years ago Queen Ann's Bounty issued a report upon the proposed union of benefices, from which it appeared that about a thousand cases were considered suitable. The Bishop of Worcester (Dr. Yeatman-Biggs) has some wise words to say on this subject. He says: "It marvels me to see men desiring to amalgamate small livings. . . . They are thereby cutting off hope from the very men they wish to encourage.

Some parishes should obviously be united, but they are the exceptions. Let there, indeed, be great reforms in the bestowal of patronage ; let there be powers given to the right authority for moving incumbents from living to living ; let the same country places be the homes for students, men of slender health, and the older men, while the larger places are filled by the priests who have suitable gifts ; but it is a poor sort of reform which makes hope to the junior men less and less. A still poorer sort of reform is the attempt to better livings, at no expense to the reformer, by putting two incomes together. The real reform is the one on which the Ecclesiastical Commission is now moving, the raising of all livings to a decent level. Do this, and your small places will be eagerly sought for by the men who are suitable. And your supply of available curates will increase more fully, because you give them hope." Amalgamation does not work satisfactorily in practice. Times of service convenient to the people cannot be arranged for the congregation of both places.

Justifiable Amalgamation.

Amalgamation seems only justifiable in the City of London, where there are some sixty-six benefices most of which have no congregations. What a waste there is here ! It has been computed that " fifty churches, sixty clergy, and three thousand worshippers at most, cost £60,000 to £70,000

yearly.”¹ The only reform suggested is the pulling down of the churches, many of them built by Wren ! No wonder there is an outcry. They can be preserved, but not as parish churches. In this way some £30,000 a year would be available for work elsewhere.

The Status of the Unbeneficed Clergy.

The unbeneficed clergy sometimes receive sympathy where it is not really called for, while they fail to receive it where distinctly they should have it. People know very little about the financial position of the clergy. The hard lot of the unbeneficed is unfairly compared with the imagined affluence of the vicars and rectors. Yet it is probably true to say that the clergy while unbeneficed enjoy a financial prosperity which they never afterwards experience, always provided they have not foolishly contracted marriage when in deacon's orders or in the early days of their priesthood. Their stipends to-day are much larger than formerly ; they can live in rooms, and they have comparatively few calls upon their purse. Contrast their position with the beneficed clergy. There are some seven thousand benefices in England. The incumbents of fifteen hundred of these receive under £60 a year each, and a very large number receive less than £200 a year. It is true they have also a parsonage house, but it would be better for them if they had

¹ Rev. W. Hudson Shaw, "Church Reform League Quarterly," September, 1917.

not, for it means heavy rates and the terrible burden of a dilapidations' bill. It is not for reasons of finance that the unbeneficed need sympathy. Their hardships are not of this nature. As there are some fourteen thousand assistant curates and only about seven thousand benefices, there must always be a considerable number of clergy who must remain unbeneficed. This hardship would not be so great if they might have some security of tenure in their curacies. But what is the actual fact? While an incumbent, in his parson's freehold, is practically irremovable, even though incompetent, or in his dotage, or out of his mind, the position of the unbeneficed is precarious. There is a change of incumbent through death or removal to another parish, and more often than not it means the assistant curate is not asked to remain. A study of advertisements will quickly show that year by year after the age of thirty the chances of obtaining a curacy grow less and less. There are other reasons also, which may militate against an assistant curate's tenure. The disapprobation of some well-to-do parishioner, who on account of his money is called "influential," or the prejudice of an incumbent's wife, may carry weight. It seems a pity that the unbeneficed should not be licensed to the bishop and the diocese, and not to the incumbent and the parish.

In the Diocese of Manchester it has been agreed to make a grant of £1,250 a year towards the stipends of the unbeneficed, in order to secure to

every priest who, after fifteen years' service in the diocese is still unbeneficed, an income of £250, of which the parish is to contribute £180 and the diocese £70. This is a splendid example which other dioceses should determine to follow.

It has been trenchantly said that "the Church has long had an evil reputation for muzzling the ox that treadeth out the corn." It is utterly unfair and a grievous wrong that the unbeneficed should, after fifteen or twenty years' service, with all its accumulated experience, have an income little, if at all, larger than he earned in the first year of his priesthood, and after the age of thirty-five to forty find it increasingly difficult to obtain even a curacy. A diocesan status will help in every way. The assistant curate must not be paid from the vicar's private pocket.

References are demanded from assistant curates. They should be demanded also from incumbents. Let it be clearly understood that the assistant curate is not the paid helper of the incumbent, but an accredited minister of the Church. Too much is sometimes heard about "my curate," and one is inclined to imagine that the three orders of the ministry are not Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, but Bishops, Vicars, and Curates.

Representation in Convocation.

A vote for the representatives of the clergy in Convocation is denied to the unbeneficed. This may

seem a small matter, but it tends to emphasize a false distinction between beneficed and unbeneficed. This disability ought to be removed. Must property ever have the monopoly of privilege even in the Church? The representation of the clergy in Convocation is based upon property; it should be based on priesthood. Meantime there is a piecemeal remedy available. When Dr. Boutflower was Archdeacon of Barrow-in-Furness, the unbeneficed were invited to meet the beneficed, for the purpose of selecting proctors. After the selection the unbeneficed withdrew, and the beneficed clergy legally confirmed the selection that had been made. This procedure might well be followed in every archdeaconry.

There is another way of obtaining the representation of the unbeneficed. The Dean and Chapter of Rochester gave a lead. They chose an unbeneficed clergyman to represent them in the Lower House, and it can now be said that the Lower House of the York Convocation has also found a place for a proctor who is unbeneficed. This progressive step might advantageously be repeated. With caustic truth it has been said that "the peculiar genius of the Church of England is an infinite capacity for taking time . . . *festina lente* is, no doubt, a good phrase, but it is not needed as a warning in the Church of England; something like an earthquake would be much more appropriate."¹

¹ "Church Reform League Quarterly," January, 1917.

CHAPTER VIII.

REUNION.

IN our Saviour's supreme prayer "that all may be one" lies the assured desire for a unity which shall convert the world. From sheer and hopeless despair of being able to achieve and see an external unity, men have read into His words a spiritual meaning. There is no small reason for a despair of visible unity, for there has never in the history of the Church been a complete expression of it. Down the corridor of centuries comes the echo of the Corinthian Church: "I am of Paul, I of Cephas, I of Apollos." Later, at the moment of Constantine's conversion, this emperor, having found Christianity, is shocked by the divisions of Christendom, as he deals with Donatists in Northern Africa and with Arianism in a wider zone. Still later, there is the great schism between East and West, and then the unhappy divisions of Western Christendom, until at this present time we gaze in almost hopeless despair at the ever-increasing disunion of those who "profess and call themselves Christians." Perhaps there is more unity among us than

seems at first sight to be the case. It is possible that unity has been confused with uniformity. Our way lies then not along the road of despair but by the path of the possibility of reunion. The mind must not acquiesce in the doctrine that disunion is a permanent factor in the Christian Church. It will not be an easy path for Anglicans, for on the one hand the Roman Church is rigid and unbending, and on the other Dissent tends to be more and more vague.

The Church of England as Reconciler

The Mother Church of England is "set to be a reconciler of Christendom." She alone has points of contact with all the denominations, and further, she has not broken with the past. Through the historic episcopate, she is in contact with the ancient Churches of East and West, and through her appeal to the Scriptures she is in touch with the non-episcopal denominations of the Reformation. She already holds fast what is old; she must not be afraid to face and to interpret that which is new.

Ill-considered Schemes.

The danger and the shame of our divisions are being more and more realized, but we must not on this account be drawn into ill-considered schemes of reunion, or think there are "short-cuts" to it.

It is a doubtful compliment to invite a dissenting minister to read the lesson at a united service, for

this is to give him but a privilege enjoyed by one of our own laymen. The invitation to a corporate Communion is scarcely a wise proceeding, for it sets aside a rubric, and confers a privilege on Dissenters which is denied to the Church's own children, who may not have been confirmed. When a service of this kind was held at the time of the Coronation,¹ the Bishop of Hereford (Dr. Percival) pleaded that the rubric was merely "a domestic rule" and not a law. He probably had in mind the affirmation in all editions of the Prayer Book that "in these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only." When Anglicans did not feel able to endorse this opinion, their position was misunderstood by some, as evidenced by some words at a meeting of the Congregational Union. The speaker said it "did not seem very much to ask that Nonconformists should be regarded as fellow-Christians," and when he went on to declare that "the great mass of those who were conspicuous leaders of the Anglican Church held that only those who had been confirmed in the Church should be entitled to attend the communion of the Church," his hearers greeted the sentiment with cries of "Shame!"² It was not a question of fellow-Christians, but of the rules of the Church. The man who voluntarily leaves his father's home has no legitimate grievance if he has not been allowed to take the furniture with him; and if people voluntarily leave a society they must not expect to re-enter

¹ At Hereford Cathedral.

² Rev. Silvester Horne, M.P.

it on their own terms. It is not blameworthy to have terms of membership and to see that these terms are obeyed.

A Measure of Co-operation.

A preliminary step towards reunion will be the manifestation of greater friendliness and co-operation in all kinds of social and philanthropic work. Another step in the same direction, which involves no sacrifice of principle, would be a readiness to observe, with the Church, the fasts and festivals. It is no uncommon experience to see Dissenters in Church on Christmas Day and Good Friday. It would be a better sign of reunion if not only these but other days were observed in all the chapels. Dr. Campbell Morgan uttered some significant words¹ when he said: "I have very little personal veneration for times and seasons, but am always glad to avail myself of the opportunity they give to demonstrate amid many conflicting surface facts that underlying unity of the Catholic Church. I am not now discussing the value of Lent. I think it may be and is sadly abused. Let us try to redeem it from abuse, and during this Lenten period 'let us tarry round the cross, to which it leads us.'" Similarly, in a new year's pastoral letter issued in the name of the executive of the Congregational Church Aid and Home Missionary Society,¹ attention is drawn to the neglect of fasting among

¹ In a sermon on S. Luke xii. 49-55, preached 1905.

² Quoted in *Daily Mail*, January, 6, 1906.

Dissenters. "Let us regard the abstinence from food as symbolical of self-sacrifice. . . . and who will deny that this is an important element of the righteousness which the Master enjoins upon His disciples?" The same subject is discussed in the Report of the Committee of the Established Church of Scotland on Temperance.¹ Among other points emphasized was that the practice of fasting is authorized by the standards of the Church of Scotland, has the sanction of the Lord in the Sermon on the Mount, and was practised by the Apostles and all the ancient Churches, and was retained by the Scottish Reformers.

The President of the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches ² said: "I am using my privilege as president for the year to make a suggestion to the Free Churches on the lines of the Archbishops' Pastoral Letter to the Established Church. May we not join with our friends in their use of Whitsuntide? Let us unite in the intercession that the event which the season commemorates may be repeated in England to-day." One cannot but regret the "odd perverse antipathies"³ that turn the solemnity of Good Friday into a gala-day. Perhaps the nation might have been more influenced to regard the day as sacred if Christians of all denominations had been united. We cannot complain of a Good Friday fair and carnival if the chapels on that day have a congregational tea-

¹ 1911 or 1912. ² Rev. Dr. Horton.

³ Butler's "Hudibras."

party; but anything is better than a compromise which combines solemnity and jollification, as indicated in this notice which appeared in a newspaper:—"Red letter day with the ——. On Good Friday a service was held at ten thirty a.m., when an appreciative audience listened to a sermon by — on the sufferings of Christ. A public tea at five p.m. resulted in a full house. After tea a capital programme of solos, recitations, an appropriate address on the Passover, and a distribution of prizes." There is, however, growing evidence that Dissenters are gradually losing their dislike of Church seasons.¹ Some of them hesitate on the ground that they cannot accept the conventional dates, but it is the event commemorated, not the exact date, that matters. There is no sacrifice of principle in saying that every Christian of every denomination is part of "the household and family of God." Is it an unnatural thing to keep in memory the great events of our Saviour's life, and of those who worked with Him, when we willingly commemorate days associated with our own friends and relations?

But even so, we are only at the first bend of the road that leads to reunion.

Undenominationalism.

There are many who think that along the path of undenominationalism lies the solution, and that an

¹ The "Guild of Divine Service" (Wesleyan Methodist) aims at keeping the great seasons and festivals of the Christian Church, the discontinuance of the use of churches for entertainments, and of festivities on Good Friday.

"irreducible minimum" must be found, but, as the Bishop of Chicago says, "I do not want to belong to a Church of minimums. I want to belong to a Church of maximums. Maximum beliefs, gifts, duties, sacrifices." In the words of Dr. Frere, "undenominationalism is a subtraction sum the answer to which is nought." There is endorsement of such a view from an unexpected quarter. "To proclaim unsectarian Christianity is to proclaim that Christianity is dead. The love of Christ . . . may indeed be still a powerful motive, and powerful whatever the view we take of Christ's character. This passion . . . is the leverage by which alone the world can be moved . . . but this conception would be preposterous if we regarded Christ as a mere human being . . . No ! the essence of the belief is the belief in the Divinity of Christ. But accept that belief, think for a moment of all it implies, and you must admit that your Christianity becomes dogmatic in the highest degree. Unsectarian Christianity . . . proclaims the love of Christ as our motive, while it declines to make up its mind whether Christ was God or man An undogmatic creed is as senseless as a statue without shape, or a picture without colour. Unsectarian means unchristian." ¹ In 1870 Mr. Gladstone wrote to Lord Lyttleton about the Education Act of that year, explaining what it was hoped might be done to get rid of "the popular imposture of undenominational

¹ Leslie Stephen, "Freethinking and Plain Speaking," pp. 122-4. Longmans.

instruction.”¹ The same statesman elsewhere called undenominationalism a “moral monster.”² A dissenting minister described it once as “creeping paralysis.”³ Undogmatic Christianity springs from a desire after simplicity, but this desire cannot be obtained at the cost of a sacrifice of fundamentals. Dr. Hensley Henson calls it a “plausible heresy.”⁴

The Lambeth Quadrilateral.

What are these fundamentals? According to the Lambeth Quadrilateral, the basis of the Anglican requirement is (a) the maintenance of the historic episcopate; (b) the Holy Scriptures; (c) the Apostles' Creed as the baptismal symbol, and the Nicene as a statement of faith; (d) the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion. It will be seen at once that episcopacy is the crux of the difficulty, and, in Dr. Lightfoot's words, “we cannot surrender, for any immediate advantage, the threefold ministry which we have inherited from Apostolic times, and which is the historic backbone of the Church.” To the same effect are some weighty words of a great saint and scholar: “Truth is even more essential than peace. Truth first, peace afterwards; such is the scriptural order. We cannot purchase reunion by giving up anything

¹ Morley's Life, Vol. II., p. 306.

² Letter to correspondent, printed in the *Church Times*, November 16, 1894.

³ Rev. D. J. Riley, at a meeting of Free Church Ministers at Plymouth in 1897.

⁴ Letter to Archdeacon Sinclair, March, 1892.

that we believe to be essential, and we cannot wish that others should do so either." And again: "It would be futile to remove difficulties on one side by giving up things non-essential, if we were thereby only causing fresh difficulties on the other. . . . We may not advance home reunion to the detriment of the reunion of the whole Church. Not even with a view to satisfying the scruples of English Nonconformity should we be justified in making concessions which might naturally give offence to the Roman and Eastern communions. We cannot forget that we are guardians of a common heritage; witnesses to a Catholic Church which includes both Eastern and Western communions."¹ "Do you think we shall win the respect even of Dissenters by tacitly surrendering our convictions?" asks Dr. Henson in the same letter. Moreover, a tampering with the historical ministry would involve a serious breach with our own past. There is such a thing as the grace of the Christian ministry. Can we maintain that all who desire to minister possess it? Or is it limited either to those who have been chosen by a congregation, or those who have received a laying on of hands by presbyters or elders, or to those only who have received the laying on of the hands of those who have themselves received through an uninterrupted transmission? This last, it will not be denied, is the historic ministry. To maintain it is not to limit the grace of God, for He overflows

¹ The late Bishop of Gibraltar (Dr. Collins), Church Congress, 1902. Paper on "Home Reunion."

the channels of His grace. The Church of England does not go out of her way to condemn the ministry of others, nor does her faith consist of negations.¹

Conditional Ordination.

It has been suggested that as this historic ministry cannot be tampered with, the Dissenters might, in the interests of reunion, be willing to accept conditional ordination, after the analogy of conditional baptism. The words, "If thou art not already ordained, take thou authority," would be a formula, it is asserted, that surrenders nothing on either side. If the Dissenters think this, well and good; but it seems to cast a doubt about their ministry, concerning which they themselves have none.

Transitional Communicants.

It has also been suggested that in the case of "transitional" communicants confirmation should be waived. Such a policy would be only temporary, for it would automatically end with the life of the last surviving minister or communicant of the transitional period.² It was pointed out in the discussion of this question that the Prayer Book regulation must often be ignored or broken, especially in holiday seasons at health-resorts, where the great

¹ See Article 23.

² There was an interesting correspondence in the *Guardian* opened by a Nonconformist correspondent, in the issue of October 3, 1913, and closed by a leading article on November 14, 1913.

majority of visitors are unknown to the clergy, and that an earnest enquirer might study the Communion Service from beginning to end without finding any hint that he must be confirmed before joining in the service, and before partaking. But it may well be asked, Why should we surrender Confirmation?—and indeed why should Dissenters wish us to do so? What is the historic force of the rubric? “Before the Savoy Conference the Church of England required confirmation as a preliminary condition, and she was asked to abandon this. She replied with a very plain and explicit rubric, in which a concession was made to those who were ‘ready and desirous to be confirmed.’ The obvious meaning would seem to be that for seventeen years practically no confirmations had taken place in England. There were many who were ‘ready and desirous.’ It was for their sakes and theirs only that the concession was made. There was no abandonment of principle, but an authorized relaxation of principle.”¹

Confirmation is a gift of surprising value. It is nothing less than the gift of the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands; it is a Bible ordinance and Bible teaching. In the new Canadian Prayer Book the exhortation states that it is “agreeable to the scriptures and apostolic usage.” It has been treasured and uninterruptedly used by the Church from the days of the Apostles. The Dissenters might well desire to have it once again, not only for the young

¹ *Guardian* June 23 1908.

on the threshold of life, but also for those of mature years.

So also with regard to the ministry. The Church offers an Apostolic Priesthood. The Dissenter offers a gifted Prophethood. There is need of both. It is not necessary to insist upon any mediæval or monarchical episcopate. What is desired is "such modification of existing ministries, and such only, as shall bring them into line with that historical institution which Anglicans prize. They desire for those who are to become their own ministers an authorization derived from a source which has had a continuous and uninterrupted history from the primitive age, not the adoption of any particular model of ecclesiastical government."¹ This writer reminds us that the southern bishops supplied to the Scottish superintendents in 1610 not episcopacy, but consecration. It was consecration also that was given to the six Presbyterian ministers in 1661 by Sheldon and Morley.

The Dissenters have their Presidents, Chairmen, or Moderators.² These are the overseers. Let them, in a way honourable to themselves, "come into union with the continuous stream of ministerial authority."³ An interchange of pulpits, so often advocated, does not really make for reunion, because it does not touch the principle. It is con-

¹ Canon J. G. Simpson, "Constructive Quarterly": Reunion.

² At Bolton, Rev. R. W. Thompson, Minister of S. George's Road Congregational Chapel, is for five years to exercise a supervision over the Congregational Pastorates in the town. This is "a modified local episcopate."

³ Ven. H. Gresford Jones' letter in the *Guardian*.

ceivable that the Dissenters, recognizing an Anglican priest as a minister, might invite him to preach in their chapel, and his bishop might give him permission. No principle is involved, for the priest may preach the Gospel in church, or hall, or in the open street. On the other hand, a bishop might conceivably invite a dissenting minister to address Church people in the church. It is a privilege already accorded to our own laymen. It is really offering the dissenting minister very little, and no principle is violated.

We have been warned against a tendency to seek reunion on party or too narrow lines. It has been suggested in a striking article¹ "that what is most desirable is that Evangelicals should aim at reunion with Rome, and Anglo-Catholics with Protestants, and *vice versa*. In this way there will be an attempt to understand each other's principles, not by those who have most in common, but by those who have least. There ought, it is urged, to be a little group in every parish of convinced Churchmen and equally convinced Dissenters, meeting together, if possible with Roman Catholics, in order to study differences and to face burning questions.² This is far better than those 'fraternals' where clergy and dissenting ministers meet to pass compliments, and to talk empty nothings." There must be no thought either of the submission

¹ "The Church of England and other Christian Societies," by A. E. J. Rawlinson, *Guardian* October 8, 1914.

² There is such a meeting at Horbury, where it is a rule to consider only those things upon which they disagree.

of Dissenters or of imposing episcopacy or anything else upon them. There is a distinct movement from dissent to the Church, and dissenting ministers value her spirit of reverence as fostered by her ancient churches and by her prayers handed down from generation to generation, her learning, her pastoral instinct and her comprehensiveness. It was Dr. Horton, I think, whose Puritanism was influenced by "the feeling of the order, the beauty, the moderation, and the charm of the Church of England," and it is he who writes, "Spiritual affinity is a much more powerful bond of union than ecclesiastical agreement"; and again, "So soon as the English Church sees the right of Free Churchmen to be, she will be in the way of making their existence unnecessary."¹

There is a strong movement in the direction of the federation of the Free Churches. It was recently declared that "denominationalism is a decaying idea. . . . It does not commend itself to the members of our churches or to the nation at large. . . . Sectarian distinctions have ceased to be a vital issue. . . . The real issue of our time is not in the things that divide us, but in the war we wage together against materialism and godlessness."² The speaker quoted Mr. Lloyd George as saying, "The Church to which I belong is torn with a fierce dispute. One part says it is baptism into the name of the Father, and the other that it is baptism in the name of the

¹ An autobiography by R. F. Horton, D.D. Unwin.

² Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, President of Evangelical Free Churches, at Annual Council, Bradford, March 7, 1916. *The Times*, March 8.

Father. I belong to one of these parties. I feel most strongly about it. I would die for it; *but* I forget which it is!" In this way does genius under the guise of humour cast a great light upon the ecclesiastical battle-fields. There must be federation, not absorption or amalgamation.

Sacramental Unity.

The Quadrilateral includes the two sacraments as one of the four fundamentals. They are far more a bond of union than is generally imagined. It may be true that "we are all one in our prayer, but have to part company at the altar," but nevertheless, although unity may involve a "Christendom organically one," which is not yet in being, yet Christianity shares a single sacramental life. "It must be by means of sacraments more than anything else that the essential unity of the Church will ultimately be realized."¹ The two sacraments are symbols of unity, because here "are common acts of washing, of eating and drinking, sanctified by specific purpose." Not only are they symbols, they are also acts of unity. There may be a variety of meanings attached to these acts by various people, but a fundamental instinct unites all. They are, moreover, channels of unity, for we are in a great fellowship of myriads, known and unknown, at home and in lands we have never visited, who draw

¹ Mr. Coats, Baptist Minister at Birmingham, in the "Hibbert Journal."

strength and refreshment, food and cleansing, from these things, "the fewest in number, and the easiest to be observed."¹ S. Paul's conception of the two Sacraments is primarily as social ordinances. There is a grace bestowed on the individual, but the individual is a part of the social organism. At baptism the individual joins a membership, a fellowship. In the Holy Communion he partakes of one loaf, and though he is one individual of many, yet all are one bread. The Society of Friends and the Plymouth Brethren regard the Sacraments as figurative. In a sense they are, but it is a pity these followers of the Lord Christ should give up their observance on this account. They add a new interpretation, but they own allegiance to the same Master. In the interests of unity they need not renounce the use of these sacramental figures. In the Holy Communion, as in Baptism, there is designed and provided a simple single act. No one is excluded on the grounds of temperament or training, of intellect or emotion. The cleansing and the nourishment are equally for all, for north and south, for east and west, for all kindreds and races, for all types and tongues, for Parthians and Medes, for Asia and Egypt, since every one owns allegiance to the one Commanding Officer, the Lord Christ. Unintelligible to each other, we look to Him. We eat of the one Body, and drink of the one cup, as we kneel at the one table, and, so partaking, we are in union with all in every place who do

¹ S. Augustine.

the like. In a report on religious unity¹ there is a statement of differences as regards the visible society, the sacraments, and the ministry, and there is also a statement of agreement that "our Lord ordained the Sacraments of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper as not only declaratory symbols, but also effective channels of His grace, and gifts for the salvation and sanctification of men, and that these sacraments, being essentially social ordinances, were intended to affirm the obligation of corporate fellowship as well as individual confession of Him." These sacraments, however different the method of their administration, claim our Saviour's direct authority, and are older than the Church's liturgical forms and creeds, and the New Testament itself. Christians, with scarcely an exception, give them a foremost place in the life and fellowship of their particular denomination.

An Appeal to Wesleyans.

In our desire for reunion, might not a beginning be made by approaching the Wesleyans? The Wesleyan who may very earnestly desire reunion with the Church of England takes up a position something like this: "Where Jesus Christ is, there is the Church, even if I do not claim to be in the Apostolic succession in the Church of England

¹ "Towards Christian Unity," an Interim Report issued by Sub-Committee appointed by the Archbishops' Committee and Representatives of the English Free Church Commissions, in connexion with a World's Conference.

sense." He maintains that the Wesleyans have their ministry and sacraments, and that the Holy Spirit gives them His presence and His power. Why then must he seek re-ordination? Yet one is bound to ask what alternative proposal can be suggested if Wesleyans refuse re-ordination, which the Church requires as "an act of conformity to the custom of the Catholic Church"? Is there to be no concession? or is the Church expected to abandon something which she regards as essential? A "way out" might be found in the suggestion that re-ordination should not be pressed in the case of existing Wesleyan ministers,¹ but that the leading superintendents might be consecrated bishops, on the understanding that they, and they only, should ordain future candidates for the ministry. Judging by the Wesleyan "model deed,"² which goes back to 1832, and at which date some ordained ministers of the Church of England were Wesleyan preachers, there is no hindrance to the realization of Methodism as a society within the Church of England. This deed provides that no preacher may use the property "who shall maintain, promulgate, or teach any doctrine or practice contrary to what is contained in" Wesley's "Notes on the New Testament" and certain of his published sermons. It need only be added that John Wesley was a priest of the Church of England. To the date of the deed

¹ Was there not a precedent for this in Scotland, when Episcopacy was restored in Scotland under James I.?

² A copy of the deed can be had from the Methodist Publishing House, 25, City Road, E.C. 1s.

no Wesleyan preacher called himself a minister, unless he were an ordained minister of the Church of England, and except in the one case of the missionaries going abroad no Wesleyan ordination had as yet been held.

Ecclesiastical Reconstruction.

Has not the war emphasized not the need only, but also the existence of a brotherhood of the Empire? Already are being discussed educational, moral, social, and commercial reconstruction. Is there to be no ecclesiastical and religious reconstruction? It has often been argued that good religious work is aided by competition, but even in commercial circles this theory is out of date, for co-operative societies have arrived to stay. The day of the sects as sects is passed. Dr. Forsyth looks forward to "an Œcumenical Christianity composed not of national Churches, but of national types of Christianity; and within each national type a variety of cohesive and co-operant bodies which shall be (what we are not now) at least as much concerned about their unity as about their variety. The federation of honoured equals should be the note."

When the Donatists were bent on unchurching all Christians except themselves, a Catholic controversialist named Optatus proclaimed the family bond of Baptism, the one Father and the one Lord Christ, and said: "You see, Brother Parmenianus,

that the links of holy brotherhood between us and you cannot be completely severed."

Endorsement of Sancroft's Appeal.

In 1688 Archbishop Sancroft urged the bishops warmly to exhort their clergy and people "to join with us in daily fervent prayer to the God of peace for a universal blessed union of all reformed Churches, both at home and abroad, against our common enemies, and that all they who do confess the Holy Name of our dear Lord, and do agree in the truth of His Holy Word, may also meet in one Holy Communion and live in perfect unity and godly love."¹ Commenting on and quoting these words, Dr. Hensley Henson pleaded for the recognition of the essential agreement of those who accept the Reformation, not only in the interests of immediate efficiency, but also of a complete reconciliation which shall embrace all the members of the Christian family. "Let us first solve the problem of effective union among ourselves, whom so many forces of the past and of the present are drawing together, and then it may be that the yet larger ideal will claim us. History—that is, the voice of the Spirit in Christian experience—is an ever-present, ever-active teacher. In following the guidance which unfolds itself in history the Church moves forward to that supreme consummation which the prophetic vision of S. Paul beheld when he dwelt with reverent

¹ Wilkins, "Concilia," Vol. IV., p. 619.

enthusiasm on the glory of Christ, the Reconciler and Redeemer of Mankind. As Jew and Gentile in the past, so Catholic and Protestant in the future shall finally meet in a common devotion to Him."

¹ At the City Temple, March 25, 1917.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

GENERAL.

- Hort.* The Christian Ecclesia. Macmillan. 6/-.
Hatch. The Organization of the Early Christian Churches. Longmans. 5/-.
W. R. Inge. Truth and Falsehood in Religion. Murray. 3/6 net.
A. W. F. Blunt. Studies in Apostolic Christianity.
A. A. Charteris. The Church of Christ: its Life and Work. Baird Lectures. Macmillan. 6/-.
Rainy. The Ancient Catholic Church.
Darwell Stone. The Christian Church. Rivington. 7/6 net.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

- F. W. Puller.* The Continuity of the Church of England Before and After its Reformation. Longmans. 3/- net.
J. H. Fry. The Church of England. Skeffington. 1/- net.
Darwell Stone. The Notes of the Church. Mowbray. 1/- net.

- F. W. Worsley.* The Theology of the Church of England. Chapman & Hall. 7/6.
- Bishop Jewel.* Apology for the Defence of the Church of England.
- W. E. Collins.* Beginnings of English Church History.
- H. H. Howorth.* The Golden Days of the Early English Church. 3 vols. Murray. 12/- net each.
- W. Boyd Carpenter.* A Popular History of the Church of England. Murray. 2/6 net.
- H. J. Clayton.* Some Notes of the Church of England. S.P.C.K.
- E. J. Newell.* Popular History of the Ancient British Church. S.P.C.K. 2/6 net.
- G. Forrest Browne.* The Christian Church in these Islands Before the Coming of Augustine. S.P.C.K. 1/6 net.
- H. D. S. Sweetapple.* England's Mother Church. S.P.C.K.
- E. W. Watson.* The Church of England. Williams & Norgate. 1/- net.
- Bishop of Zanzibar.* Ecclesia Anglicana, for What does She Stand? Longmans. 6d.
- G. M. MacDermott.* Some Church Principles. Mowbray. 1/-.
- H. C. Beeching.* The Bible Doctrine of the Sacraments. Murray. 2/6 net.
- W. E. Gladstone.* Church Principles.
- H. O. Wakeman.* The Reformation in Great Britain.

- J. Gairdner.* The English Church in the Sixteenth Century.
- W. J. Carey.* A Book of Instruction for Church of England People. S.P.C.K. 1/- net.
- C. Gore.* The Religion of the Church. Mowbray. 1/6 net.
- F. H. Chase.* Confirmation in the Apostolic Age. Macmillan. 2/6 net.
- Barnes-Lawrence.* A Churchman and his Church. Longmans. 1/6 net.
- A. T. Wirgman.* The Doctrine of Confirmation.
- J. Denton Thompson.* Revived Churchmanship. Longmans. 2/6 net.
- Alfred Fawkes.* The Genius of the English Church Murray. 1/6 net.

THE CHURCH AND ROMANISM.

- H. L. Goudge.* The Invocation of Saints and the Cult of the Blessed Virgin. Mowbray. 1/- net.
- Salmon.* The Infallibility of the Church. Murray. 2/6 net.
- C. Gore.* Roman Catholic Claims.
- Dom John Chapman.* Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims. Longmans.
- Littledale.* Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome.
- H. J. D. Ryder.* Catholic Controversy ; a Reply to Dr. Littledale. Burns & Oates.
- Bishop of Grafton.* Letters from Rome.

- Percy Dearmer.* Reunion and Rome. Mowbray.
1/6 net.
- A. Brinckman.* Notes on the Papal Claims. Mowbray.
- Walker.* Papal Claims. Knott.
- Walker.* The Pope and Ordination. Knott.
- C. S. Isaacson.* Our Brief Against Rome.
- C. S. Isaacson.* Rome in Many Lands.
- C. H. Sharpe.* Catholicism and Life. Longmans.
4/6 net
- W. J. Sparrow Simpson.* Roman Catholic Opposition to Papal Infallibility. Murray. 6/- net.
- C. Wordsworth.* Union with Rome. Longmans. 1/-.
- Norman Smyth.* Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism. Hodder & Stoughton. 5/- net.
- G. A. Cobbold.* Why I am an Anglo-Catholic. Mowbray.
- Spencer Jones.* England and the Holy See. Longmans.
- Hussey.* Rise of the Papal Power.
- Swete.* England *versus* Rome.
- Tyrrell.* Mediævalism.
- G. G. Coulton.* Mediæval Studies.
- Barron.* Papal Supremacy.
- Tillotson.* Sermon on Transubstantiation.
- Wordsworth.* Letters on Rome.
- Merry del Val.* The Truth of Papal Claims.
- J. Wordsworth.* Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII. on English Ordination. Longmans. 1/- net.

- G. V. Jourdan.* The Movement Towards Catholic Reform in the Early Sixteenth Century. Mowbray. 7/6 net.
- G. H. Collett.* Novelties of Romanism. R.T. Society.
- Jeremy Taylor.* Dissuasive from Popery.
- T. A. Lacey.* Catholicity. Mowbray. 2/6 net.
- W. J. Sparrow Simpson.* The Catholic Conception of the Church. R. Scott. 5/- net.
- F. W. Puller.* The Relation of the English Church to the Monarchical Claims of the Roman See. Longmans. 1/-.
- H. J. Clayton.* Studies in the Roman Controversy. R. Scott. 2/6 net.
- T. J. Hardy.* Catholic or Roman Catholic? R. Scott.

MINISTRY.

- R. C. Moberly.* Ministerial Priesthood. Murray. 6/- net.
- J. F. Lepine.* The Ministers of Jesus. 2 vols. Longmans. 5/- each.
- Hermitage Day.* The Ministry of the Church. Pitman.
- Lindsay.* The Church and Ministry.
- C. Gore.* The Church and the Ministry. Longmans. 6/-.
- Darwell Stone.* The Church, its Ministry and Authority. Rivington. 1/- net.

- Lightfoot.* The Christian Ministry. Macmillan.
3/- net.
- Hatch.* Organization of the Early Christian Churches. 3rd ed.; 1888.
- Lindsay.* The Christian Ministry in the First Three Centuries. 1905.

CHURCH REFORM AND SUNDRY.

- W. Cunningham.* Efficiency in the Church of England. Murray. 2/6 net.
- E. A. Knox.* Does the Ornaments Rubric necessarily Refer to the Eucharistic Vestments? Longmans. 1/- net.
- Douglas Eyre.* The Reform of the Church of England. Murray. 2/6 net.
- Alfred Fawkes.* The Things that are Cæsar's. Murray. 1/- net.
- B. W. Randolph.* The Seven Sacraments of the Universal Church. Mowbray. 1/6 net.

CHURCH AND SECT.

- G. H. Curteis.* Dissent in its Relation to the Church of England. Macmillan.
- J. Hammond.* Church or Chapel.
- W. J. Sparrow Simpson.* The Relation of the English Church to the Non-Episcopal Communion. Longmans. 6d. net.
- Silvester Horne.* History of the Free Churches. James Clarke. 1/6 net.

- R. W. Dale.* English Congregationalism. Hodder & Stoughton. 12/- net.
- J. H. Greig.* The Church and Nonconformity. Arnold. 3/6.
- H. W. Clark.* History of English Nonconformity. 2 vols. Chapman & Hall. 15/- each net.
- Skeats.* History of the Free Churches.
- H. B. Workman.* Methodism. Cambridge Manuals.
- Benson.* Non-Catholic Denominations. Longmans. 3/6 net.
- Selbie.* Nonconformity. Home University Library.
- Howard.* The Church of England and other Religious Communions.
- "*A Nonconformist Minister.*" Nonconformity and Politics. Pitman. 3/6 net.
- Victor Cambrensis.* The Rise and Decline of Welsh Nonconformity. Pitman. 1/- net.
- A. G. Edwards.* Landmarks in the History of the Welsh Church. Murray. 6/- net.
- R. C. Moberly.* Undenominationalism. Murray. 1/- net.
- P. T. Forsyth, D.D.* The Church and the Sacraments. Longmans. 6/- net.

CHURCH AND STATE.

- Ridding.* Church and State : Thoughts Applicable to Present Conditions. Mowbray. 2/- net.
- Earl of Selborne.* A Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment. Macmillan. 1/- net.

- Gordon Crosse.* Church and State in Theory and Practice. Mowbray. 1/- net.
- Hamilton Hoare.* The Disestablishment Question. S.P.C.K. 6d.
- Thomas Moore.* The Englishman's Brief on Behalf of his National Church. S.P.C.K. 8d.
- J. N. Figgis.* Churches in the Modern State. Longmans. 4/6 net.
- H. Hensley Henson.* The National Church.
- A. L. Smith.* Church and State in the Middle Ages. Clarendon Press. 7/6 net.
- Sir H. Lewis.* Is Disestablishment Just? R. E. Jones. 6/-.
- J. E. C. Welldon.* The Religious Aspects of Disestablishment and Disendowment. Smith Elder. 3/6 net.
- Bennett and Bartlett.* Disendowment, its Legal and Moral Aspects. Liberation Society. 3d.
- A. J. C. Allen.* The Freedom of the so-called Free Churches. S.P.C.K. 6d. net.
- . How Dissent is Established and Endowed. Grosvenor Library. 1/-.
- J. F. Bradley.* The Case Against Welsh Disendowment. Pitman. 1/-.
- J. F. Bradley.* Nonconformists and the Welsh Church Bill.
- A. P. Stanley.* Essays chiefly on Questions of Church and State, 1850-1870. Murray. 6/-.
- J. K. Floyer.* Studies in the History of English Church Endowments.

- A. C. Headlam.* The Revenues of the Church.
Murray. 2/6 net.
- Various.* Church Self - Government Papers.
S.P.C.K. $\frac{1}{2}d.$ each.

UNITY AND REUNION.

- Herbert Kelly.* The Church and Religious Unity.
Longmans. 4/6.
- Silas McBee.* An Eirenic Itinerary. Longmans.
4/6.
- John Wordsworth.* Unity and Fellowship. S.P.C.K.
1/6.
- C. Gore.* The Basis of Anglican Fellowship in Faith
and Organization. Mowbray. 6d.
- W. Sanday.* The Primitive Church and Reunion.
Oxford Press. 4/6 net.
- W. Sanday.* Towards Reunion. Oxford Press. 4/6
net.
- Gerald Sampson.* Catholic Truth and Unity. Mow-
bray. 1/6 net.
- W. L. Grane.* Church Divisions and Christianity.
Macmillan. 5/- net.
- Bishop of Zanzibar.* The Case against Kikuyu.
Longmans. 1/-.
- Bishop of Uganda.* The Kikuyu Conference.
Longmans. 6d.
- Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa.* Steps towards
Reunion. Longmans. 1/-.
- H. A. Wilson.* Episcopacy and Unity. Longmans.
3/6.

- R. F. Horton.* The Reunion of English Christendom.
- J. Armitage Robinson.* The Vision of Unity Longmans. 1/-.
- C. Gore.* Orders and Unity. Murray. 3/6 net.
- B. W. Maturin.* The Price of Unity. Longmans. 5/- net.
- H. Hensley Henson.* Godly Union and Concord.
- T. A. Lacey.* Unity and Schism. Mowbray. 5/- net.

INDEX.

- Act of Parliament Church*, 178.
Augustine comes to England, 177.
Baptism, 40; of infants, 41; testimony of IRENÆUS, 41; of Origen, 41; of Justin Martyr, 42; its significance, 45; generally necessary to salvation, 46; for remission of sins, 47; Members of Christ, etc., 48; is total immersion necessary? 52; Canterbury House of Laymen's resolution *re* administration, 53.
Bishops, 27; Gibbon on, 30; Tertullian on, 30.
Britain, the Church in, 176.
Brotherhood, 58.
Catholic, 13; Cyril's definition, 15; Vincent's test, 15; Ambrose's use, 15; Catholicity, 65.
Church Association, 160.
Churchmanship, reasons for our, 136.
Communion, Holy, 53.
Confession, 114; Cranmer and Latimer's defence of, 114, 115; Church of England allows, but does not compel, 115.
Confirmation, 36; testimony of dissent, 37.
Congé d'élire, 246.
Continuity, pre- and post-Reformation Church identical, 22; Mr. Asquith's testimony, 22; Prof. Freeman's, 22, the Church in Britain, 176.
Conviction, 67.
Convocation, Parliament's authority over, 216.
Deacons, work and appointment, 27.
Dissent, schism, 126; are the differences vital? 126; modern distinctions, 127; opinions of Dr. Henson, Dr. Morgan Gibbon, and others, 127; an appeal to the N.T., 129; modern and man-made, 129; John Wesley's teaching, 131; If St. Paul visited England! 137.
Dissenter who forfeits respect, 122; who gains it, 122; Dissenter or Nonconformist? 124.
Disestablishment, 208; is privilege justified? 208; Paley's view, 209; what the Church would gain by, 209; its effect in Ireland, 211; of the Church in Wales, 214; identity of it with England, 215; endorsed by Mr. Gladstone, 215;
Duties as Churchmen, fulfilment of, 57.

reasons for disestablishment in Wales, 217; same considered, 218.

Disendowment, effect in Ireland, 213; are disestablishment and disendowment inseparable? 219; a compromise, 220; precedent for the transference of endowments, 222; the Church's reasonable claim to hers, 223; the Romanist view, 224.

Eastward Position, 162; "Purchas" and "Ridsdale" cases, 162; prayer book guidance, 163.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 201.

England, Church of, former sloth, 119; a Wesleyan's lament, 119; becomes "the National Church" under Theodore, 179.

Episcopacy, Is it the "esse" or the "bene esse" of the Church? 31; regarded as "bene esse" by Dissent, 33; is sacramental grace only through this channel? 34.

Established by Law, 178; bears different meaning at different periods, 180; first appearance in Act of Parliament, 180; its meaning in 1665, 180.

Establishment, benefits the State, not the Church, 181; Mr. Gladstone's statement, 182; a jarring note on public occasions, 183; two advantages—(a) national recognition of religion, 181; (b) the parochial system, 183; the privileges of, 184; the disabilities of, 186.

Free Churches, "freedom" of, 187; Wesley's Deed Poll, 188; Free Church Council favours an appeal to Parliament, 188; the case of a trust deed, 188; opinion of the *Christian World*, and of the *Christian Commonwealth*, 189; report of Charity Commissioners, 189.

Government, self: A scandalous defect, 190; precedents for, 190; a sign of the State's desire, 194; Church and State report, 194; Parliament and Church Legislation, 195; a remarkable Bill, 197.

Heath, J. St. G., quoted, 7.

Hooker quoted, 9, 44.

Ignatius, use of word Catholic, 14; on the threefold ministry, 29.

Immaculate Conception, 88.

Immersion, total, 52.

Indulgences, 104.

Infallibility, 78.

Intelligence, need of, 56.

Intolerance, 120.

Invocation of Saints, 112.

Irenæus, reference to baptism of infants, 41.

Life and Liberty, 224.

Lights, Altar, "*Martin v. Makonochie*," 167; the Lincoln judgment, 167; significance of lights, 169.

Loose Phrases, 59.

Loyalty, 122.

- Mass*, derivations of, 105 ; Dr. Creighton on its use, 107 ; Dr. Liddon, 108 ; Mr. Allen Whitworth, 108.
- Masses*, sacrifice of, 105 ; a story by Gregory of Tours, a Romanist's defence, 111.
- Ministry*, threefold, 26 ; Ignatius on, 29 ; Canons of Hippolytus on, 30 ; Bishop Collins, 32.
- Misconceptions*, 61.
- Origen*, on infant baptism, 41.
- Ornaments Rubric*, 171 ; opinion of Ritual commission, 172 ; of individual members, 173.
- Parties*, 143 ; minor differences, 143 ; intelligible differences, 144 ; special aspects, 144 ; no narrow suspicion or ignorance, 145 ; what each party stands for, 146 ; Church needs each, 154.
- Pope* as universal monarch, 68 ; meaning of word, 70 ; growth of claim, 71 ; texts in support, 73.
- Prayers for the Dead*, 93 ; use by Jews to-day, 94 ; the mind of the Reformers, 95 ; Bishop Andrewes, 96 ; Cosin, 96, Bishop Moule, 98 ; Archbishop Temple, 99 ; Bishop Stubbs, 100 ; Paget (Oxford), 100 ; Dean Wace, 100 ; Dr. Salmon, 100 ; Archbishop Benson, 101 ; Dr. Neale, 101 ; Thackeray, 102 ; Court of Arches, 103 ; Archbishop Lowther-Clarke, 103.
- Priests*, 27.
- Property of Church* : Does it belong to the nation ? 198 ; to the Roman Church ? 199 ; Romanist testimony, 201.
- Protestant*, 17 ; first use of word, 17 ; a restricted meaning, 17 ; the Coronation Oath, 18.
- Purgatory*, 92.
- Quadrilateral*, Lambeth, four fundamentals of reunion, 264.
- Queen Ann's Bounty*, 203.
- Reform* : The Church's claim to spiritual independence, 226 ; the proposed Church Council, 227 ; the franchise, 228 ; opposing views, 228 ; extension of episcopate, 230 ; abolition of deaneries, 231 ; fatal opulence of bishops, 232 ; Cathedral chapters, 223 ; parson's freehold, 236 ; poor stipends and large houses, 237 ; some amazing advertisements, 238 ; a barbarous method of stipend, 240 ; patronage, 242 ; appointment to bishoprics, 244 ; an archaic farce, 246 ; patronage boards in Ireland, 247 ; fees, 248 ; dilapidations, 249 ; exchange of benefices, 249 ; union of 251 ; justifiable in London, 252 ; status of unbeneficed, 253 ; their representation in Convocation, 255.
- Relics*, adoration of, 113.
- Reunion*, 257 ; Church as reconciler, 258 ; ill-considered schemes, 258 ; co-operation, 260 ; not through undenominationalism, 262 ; views of Dr. Lightfoot, 264 ; Professor Collins, 265 ; Conditional ordination, 266 ; transitional communicants, 266 ; Sacramental unity, 271 ; an appeal

- to Wesleyans, 273; Reconstruction, 275; Sancroft's appeal, 276.
- Roman Catholic*, term endorsed by Vatican, 13; steadfastness, 62; faith nearer ours than the Dissenters', 63; validity of our ministry, 64; lessons from, 117.
- Sacraments* as emblems of unity, 54, 271
- Sponsorship*, 49.
- Tertullian* on succession of bishops, 30.
- Tithes*, 204; origin obscure, 204; enjoined by Augustine of Hippo (354-430), 204; by Archbishop of York (in 740), 204; Justice Phillimore on, 205; Mr. Asquith on, 206; Prof. Freeman on, 206; effect of disendowment on, 207; a barbarous method of stipend, 240.
- Toleration*, 66.
- Transubstantiation*, 80; Dr. Liddon quoted, 82; Cyril of Jerusalem, 83; Churchman's declaration (in 1867), 83.
- Undenominationalism*, 262; opinions of Bishop of Chicago, Dr. Frere, Mr. Leslie Stephen, Mr. Gladstone, Dr. Henson, 263, 264.
- Unfair Statements* about Romanists, 61.
- Vestments*, testimony of Ritual Commission, 170.
- Vincent of Lerins*, test of Catholicity, 15.
- Worship of the Virgin*, 86.

Printed for
ROBERT SCOTT,
Roxburghe House, Paternoster Row, E.C.,
By Jarvold & Sons, Ltd., Norwich.



280.3R
Marsdin, A.C.C. D.D. C788

Church or sect.

280.3R
C788

